21119

NATIONAL LIBRARY
OTTAWA

BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE
OTTAWA

NAME OF AUTHOR.....MRS. LILLIAN SWITLICK.....

TITLE OF THESIS..AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF FACTORS
AFFECTING RESPONSES OF CREE STUDENTS
TO LITERARY SELECTIONS.....

UNIVERSITY.....of Alberta (Edmonton).....

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED. Master of Education

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED.....1974.....

Permission is hereby granted to THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed)....L. Switlick.....

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

....Box 212.....
....Gleichen,.....
....Alberta T0J 1N0.....

DATED. April 18th.....1974

NL-91 (10-68)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF FACTORS AFFECTING RESPONSES OF CREE STUDENTS TO LITERARY SELECTIONS

by

© LILLIAN SWITLICK

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1974

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled An Exploratory Study of Factors Affecting Responses of Cree Students to Literary Selections submitted by Lillian Switlick in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

Marion D Jenkinson
Supervisor

H. L. Dewit

Allen Berger

Date April 2nd 1974

ABSTRACT OF THE STUDY

This study was an attempt to explore the free, nondirected oral responses of Cree subjects to three literary selections. The data were examined to determine the kinds of reactions evoked. They were further scrutinized to identify factors which had apparently affected the accuracy of comprehension of the selections.

The tape-recorded reactions were transcribed and separated into classified responses according to the seven kinds devised by Squire. Separation was based solely on the psychological nature of the reactions. The greatest number was found to be Narrational, with Interpretational a close second, and Self-involvement third. Much smaller numbers were placed in the remaining four classifications.

The reactions were reexamined for evidence of accurate comprehension, and on the basis of that evidence were placed in one of the major categories of Acceptable, Miscellaneous or Deviant responses. The first category received the greatest number. Subcategories were then established within the main groups, and the responses in each analyzed and compared. Accurate Reconstruction of the story details was found to be the predominant Acceptable category.

Factors affecting comprehension were identified as Experiential, Linguistic and Reading factors; and once again subcategories were established within each of these groups. Linguistic factors were found to be the greatest barriers to accurate comprehension. But in all of the categories what was known and familiar was projected into the reading material in the absence of the assumed knowledge and

experience.

The data provided evidence of a relationship between oral language fluency and proficiency in reading. The influence of personal experiences on the interpretation of literary selections was also indicated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincerest appreciation to all of the following who have each contributed towards the completion of this study:

The thirty-nine subjects of Ermineskin School who worked so hard to give of their very best.

Father Regnier and the staff of Ermineskin School for their generous cooperation during the process of data collecting.

The five interviewers—Jessie Campbell, Patty Holditch, Don Northey, Brian Swann and Gerald McQuade—to whose patience and sympathetic understanding is owed the successful collection of the data.

My supervisor, Dr. Marion D. Jenkinson, for her great tolerance and her gentle, persuasive encouragement.

Dr. G. L. Berry and Dr. A. Berger, members of my committee, for their helpful suggestions at the final oral examination.

Mr. and Mrs. D. Zuk, both over 70 years of age, for considerable financial support during the compulsory periods of non-employment required for the analysis and organization of the data.

My husband, Ray, for willing assistance in whatever area it was required.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
1.	INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
	The Problem	2
	Statement of the Problem	2
	Background of the Problem	2
	The Nature and Purpose of Language	2
	Response to Literature	6
	Methods of Measuring Response to Literature	8
	Design of Squire's Study	9
	Major Questions	11
	Design of the Study	11
	Significance of the Study	12
	Limitations of the Study	14
	Overview of the Chapters	14
2.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	16
	Studies of Misunderstandings and Misinterpretations	16
	Background of the Reader	20
	Personality of the Reader	23
	Dimensions of Response	27
3.	DESIGN OF THE STUDY	35
	Collection of the Data	35
	Selection of the Subjects	35
	Selection and Treatment of the Stories	36

CHAPTER PAGE

Selection of Interviewers 39

Criteria for Interviewing 39

Interview Procedures 40

Treatment of the Data 42

Division into Recording Units 43

Division into Classified Reactions 44

Discussion of Squire's Classifications 52

4. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA—COMPREHENSION OF LITERARY SELECTIONS . 59

Establishing the Categories 59

Redefined Response 59

Comparison of Responses to Each Story 60

Separation into Major Categories 63

Comparison of Responses in Each Category 65

Acceptable Responses to Each Story 68

Miscellaneous Responses to Each Story 70

Deviant Responses to Each Story 73

Further Analysis of the Responses 77

Outline of Categories and Subcategories 77

Establishing Acceptable Categories 78

Accurate Reconstruction 79

Recognizing Experiences 84

Understanding Characters 86

Recognizing Relationships 87

Appropriate Reactions 90

Comparison of Acceptable Categories 93

CHAPTER PAGE

Establishing Miscellaneous Categories 96

Exact Quotations 99

Ambiguous Remarks 100

Incomplete Statements 101

Irrelevant Ideas 102

Unsubstantiated Generalizations 103

Vague, Inarticulate Comments 104

Comparison of Miscellaneous Categories 105

Establishing Deviant Categories 110

Wrong Character Identification 112

Wrong Report of the Action 113

Misunderstanding Characters 115

Wrong Associations 116

Wrong Relationships Established 118

Inappropriate Reactions 119

Comparison of Deviant Categories 121

Summary of the Chapter 126

5. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA—FACTORS INHIBITING COMPREHENSION . . 127

Basis for Analysis 127

Exploration of Factors 130

Comparison of Factors 131

Establishing Categories of Inhibiting Factors 134

Comparison of Factors in Each Category 138

Experiential Factors 139

Linguistic Factors 141

CHAPTER PAGE

Reading Factors 143

Further Analysis of the Factors 144

Outline of Categories and Subcategories 146

Establishing Experiential Categories 147

Didactic Expectations 149

Story-telling Expectations 150

Literal Understandings 151

Background of the Stories 152

Personal Experiences 153

Personal Culture 154

Predetermined Attitudes 157

Comparison of Factors in Experiential Categories 159

Establishing Linguistic Categories 164

Pronoun errors 165

Other Syntactical Errors 166

Vocabulary Deficiencies 169

Dialect and Idiolect 170

Unconventional Character Identification 171

Inability to Translate Idiom 173

Comparison of Factors in Linguistic Categories 175

Establishing Reading Categories 180

Non-reading 182

Word Recognition 184

Author's Techniques 186

Disregard of Punctuation 189

CHAPTER PAGE

Complex Sentence Structure 192

Projection of Oral Language 195

Inability to Identify Referents 198

Comparison of Factors in Reading Categories 199

Summary of the Chapter 204

6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 205

Summary of the Study 205

Summary and Discussion of the Findings 206

Question 1 207

Question 2 211

Question 3 217

Implications for Curriculum 232

Selection of Materials 232

Oral Language 235

Implications for Teachers 237

Suggestions for Further Study 241

Conclusion 242

BIBLIOGRAPHY 243

APPENDIX A. THE STORIES 250

APPENDIX B. IDEA UNITS 275

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
1	Individual and Group Numerical Scores of Responses in Squire's Classifications	53
2	Numerical Means of Responses in Squire's Classifications	55
3	Ranges and Median Percentages of Responses in Squire's Classifications	56
4	Individual Percentages of Responses in Squire's Classifications	57
5	Ranges and Numerical Means of Responses to Each of the Stores	60
6	Individual and Group Numerical Scores of Responses to Each of the Stories	62
7	Ranges and Median Percentages of Responses in Major Categories	65
8	Individual Percentages of Responses in Major Categories	67
9	Ranges and Median Percentages of Acceptable Responses to Each Story	68
10	Individual Percentages of Acceptable Responses to Each Story	69
11	Ranges and Median Percentages of Miscellaneous Responses to Each Story	71
12	Individual Percentages of Miscellaneous Responses to Each Story	72
13	Ranges and Median Percentages of Deviant Responses to Each Story	74
14	Individual Percentages of Deviant Responses to Each Story	75
15	Individual and Group Numerical Scores of Responses in Acceptable Categories	94

Table	Description	Page
16	Ranges and Median Percentages of Responses in Acceptable Categories	95
17	Individual Percentages of Responses in Acceptable Categories	97
18	Individual and Group Numerical Scores of Responses in Miscellaneous Categories	106
19	Ranges and Median Percentages of Responses in Miscellaneous Categories	107
20	Individual Percentages of Responses in Miscellaneous Categories	109
21	Individual and Group Numerical Scores of Responses in Deviant Categories	122
22	Ranges and Median Percentages of Responses in Deviant Categories	124
23	Individual Percentages of Responses in Deviant Categories	125
24	Ranges and Mean Numerical Scores of Potentially Inhibiting Factors in Responses to Each Story	131
25	Individual and Group Numerical Scores of Inhibiting Factors in Responses to Each Story	133
26	Ranges and Median Percentages of Inhibiting Factors in Each Category	136
27	Individual Percentages of Inhibiting Factors in Each Category	137
28	Ranges and Median Percentages of Experiential Factors in Responses to Each Story	139
29	Individual Percentages of Experiential Factors in Responses to Each Story	140
30	Ranges and Median Percentages of Linguistic Factors in Responses to Each Story	141
31	Individual Percentages of Linguistic Factors in Responses to Each Story	142

Table	Description	Page
32	Ranges and Median Percentages of Reading Factors in Responses to Each Story	143
33	Individual Percentages of Reading Factors in Responses to Each Story	144
34	Individual and Group Numerical Scores of Factors in Experiential Categories	160
35	Ranges and Median Percentages of Factors in Experiential Categories	161
36	Individual Percentages of Factors in Experiential Categories	163
37	Individual and Group Numerical Scores of Factors in Linguistic Categories	176
38	Ranges and Median Percentages of Factors in Linguistic Categories	177
39	Individual Percentages of Factors in Linguistic Categories	179
40	Individual and Group Numerical Scores of Factors in Reading Categories	200
41	Ranges and Median Percentages of Factors in Reading Categories	201
42	Individual Percentages of Factors in Reading Categories	203

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Literature study is offered as part of the general curriculum of the junior high schools in Alberta. The literature program revolves around specific texts authorized by the Department of Education. Yet, although a minority of the population of the junior high schools are Indian students, the relevancy of the selections in the texts to these students has never been questioned.

Studies of response to literature have been conducted in the United States over a number of years (Cross, 1940; Forman, 1951; Loban, 1954; Taba, 1955; Squire, 1956). These studies uncovered difficulties faced by readers of the junior and senior high school grades. Yet these readers were members of the dominant culture. It was assumed that they shared the language, the way of life, and the value orientations inherent in the selections. Response to authorized selections of Indian readers who do not share the language, the way of life, or the value orientations inherent in the selections, has never been explored. It might be assumed, however, that the difficulties faced by them would be far greater than those facing the non-Indian junior high school population.

This study then is an exploratory one—exploring the responses of a small group of Cree subjects to literary selections of the kind likely to be found in a class anthology for junior high school readers.

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

The problem investigated is the examination of classified oral responses of thirty-nine Cree junior high school students to three literary selections.

The purpose of the examination is to identify linguistic and experiential factors in the responses, which would seem to have contributed to the degree of accuracy of comprehension of the selections.

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

In Gray's opinion, mastery of the whole linguistic process, including the interpretive aspect of language, is "one of the most important factors influencing progress in reading." So much so that,

> only as a child's command of language develops, will his ability to read with understanding improve . . . (Gray, 1956, p. 73)

In view of the above opinion, a study such as the one reported here, cannot afford to ignore linguistic theory, of which the theory of literature is an integral part (Pollock, 1965, p. 163). The first section of this division of the chapter, therefore, will present the opinion of experts on the linguistic process, including reading and literature. The remaining three sections deal with: (1) response to literature, (2) methods of measuring response, and (3) the design of Squire's study.

The Nature and Purpose of Language

The fine distinction between the nature and purpose of language

is very difficult to disentangle, since unless its purpose is achieved language, as such, does not exist.

Language is not simply speech; it is an activity—a systematic process of encoding and decoding (Sapir, 1949, p. 8). It has been defined as a process through which signs made "in a certain time order" enable one individual to communicate with another (Pollock, 1965, p. 18). In other words, the use of signs is not sufficient; they must be placed in a certain relationship with each other.

Language has also been defined as a human activity involving the use of words by one individual, which may or may not, have the power of evoking the same idea in the mind of another. It is a deliberate attempt

> to bring to the consciousness of one individual what is passing in the mind of another. (Jesperson, 1964, p. 7)

Language is not automatic; unless there is some communication, there may be speech, but there is no language. Yet language is, to a very large extent, acquired.

A child learns his mother tongue in the functional environment of the home and its surroundings, where he has "abundant opportunities" of watching people engaged in their everyday activities, and of listening to the accompanying verbal dialogue. The words of the language, together with their symbolic interpretation are "picked up" almost unconsciously, with little if any, direct teaching (Whitehead, 1966, p. 15). A child's speech units are also structured according to his observation of "meanings," and his abstraction of grammatical components made possible by an accumulation of similar language experiences.

As one moves away from the close family relationship, however, the same sign begins to hold different meanings for those who use it, because of different past experiences associated with it. The possibility of misunderstanding with regards to the same native language thus becomes evident, even though the same system of sounds—the same symbolic code is used.

The symbolic code of the written language, since it is a graphic representation of sounds, is much more liable to being misunderstood. The whole reading process needs to be learned in a manner the reverse of that by means of which a child acquired his mother tongue. It is far too complex to be "picked up" incidentally.

A potential reader needs to be able to recognize at sight, or as quickly as possible, the words represented by the printed symbols. But as soon as they are recognized, they are given the denotative and connotative meanings already associated with the oral symbols.

He needs to be familiar with the new code system in the absence of non-verbal clues which had become for him habitually associated with the spoken word. This means that such conventional techniques of the written language as punctuation symbols, quotation marks, and other devices used as clues to meaning, need to be mastered if their function is to be recognized.

The reader also needs to be capable of correctly identifying the antecedent of pronouns, and of recognizing when a literal or figurative meaning is appropriate in the context. In the latter case, he needs to be capable of substituting "a roughly equivalent set of terms" (Harris, 1948, p. 283).

Reading, thus, is a continuous process of translating, of fusing meanings, and of reorganizing experience. It consists of applying knowledge, skills and experience to obtain meaning from the printed page. It also involves the ability to grasp meanings beyond those contained explicitly in the words of the author; and this requires attitudes and skills which need carefully planned guidance, since they "do not develop automatically" (Gray, 1956, pp. 69-70).

In addition, a great deal of experience is required before meaning can be derived from the complicated sentence structures often found in written material, but never heard in speech. Thus, as speech is not language, neither is the correct articulation of the written verbal symbols, reading. Proficiency in reading means comprehending what the writer has expressly stated, and what he has implied.

Learning to read and respond to literature, on the other hand, requires more than proficiency in reading. Literature is a special art form, and although it is a process of communication by means of linguistic symbols, what is communicated is not information; it is "a symbolic experience" (Hayakawa, 1965, pp. 132-3). Its aesthetic function is achieved by using, exploiting, and even doing violence to the resources of the language to create a vivid experience (Wellek and Warren, 1956, pp. 20-6). Through the use of evocative symbolism, and highly connotative language, the writer attempts to draw the reader into the experience, and evoke in him intellectual or emotional satisfaction (Rosenheim, 1966, pp. 11-5).

Nevertheless, the successful accomplishment of his purpose does not lie in the hands of the artist alone. While the literary work

should have the power of evoking a satisfying experience, the reader needs to be capable of entering into the experience, and of responding to it (Brittton, 1954, p. 199); he needs to be "a properly qualified reader" (Pollock, 1965, p. 173).

His "stage of linguistic growth" with regards to knowledge of the vocabulary, the sentence structure, and the literary techniques used, will clearly affect his reaction to a literary selection (Whitehead, 1966, p. 62). Learning to read literature requires knowledge and understanding beyond those required at the cognitive level. It requires intellectual and emotional comprehension and interpretation. A successful literary experience depends upon the reader's recognition of the experiences presented; on his association of them with similar previous experiences; and on his reaction to them that finally was aroused.

Response to Literature

It has long been recognized that an affirmative response by a reader is the only valid criterion that a satisfying experience had been evoked by a literary selection. Cecil, in fact, declares that "the impression left upon the reader is the only real test of a book's merit" (Cecil, 1950, p. 6). Norvell insists that appreciation, or literary evaluation, is always the book plus the child (Norvell, 1950, p. 436); and Burton emphasizes that a successful literary experience is "the right book for the right child" (Burton, 1957, p. 186).

This aspect of the "symbolic experience" has been widely reiterated. There is evident agreement, nevertheless, that only one part

of that success is provided by the writer (Pollock, 1965, p. 55); and in the absence of a reader who finds the work to be good or significant, literature, as such does not exist (Davies, 1965, p. 104).

If, in spite of the deliberate exploitation of the language for the purpose of capturing the reader's attention and holding his interest, the literary work does not evoke an affective response, the author's purpose has not been achieved, and his work has failed as literature. This situation has been aptly summed up by Britton:

> . . . no impact—no synthesis—no experience—no poem . . . (Britton, 1954, p. 199)

Circumstances likely to result in failure of the literary work to evoke an affective response were discovered recently during the reorganization of Indian schools in the United States. In spite of their quite different upbringing and background from that depicted in the literature, Indian children were being required to read Restoration comedies (Rosenblatt, 1968, pp. 57-8).

This situation was considered by Rosenblatt to be "quite ridiculous" in view of the gap that existed between their store of associations capable of giving meaning to their reading, and the reading material itself—"the sophisticated products of a highly complex foreign country remote in time and space."

Failure of the literature to evoke an affective response in this case, could not be dismissed as "Failure to grasp the meaning," or "Irrelevant associations." It would have been attributable to the barriers imposed by an insufficient store of relevant experiences on the part of the readers. They were, thus, totally unprepared for the

task they were being asked to perform, if that task were literary evaluation.

Methods of Measuring Response to Literature

Before the 1950's studies concerned with response to literature were very rare, no doubt because of the difficulty of formulating hypotheses, and of establishing a satisfactory form of measurement.

With the introduction of factor analysis, studies were undertaken which analyzed some specific factor in the reading material, which was to some extent measurable, and attempts were made to hypothesize its effect upon the reader (Jacobs, 1947; Fisher, 1950; Sherwin, 1956).

Insights into the interaction that takes place between a reader and his text were not forthcoming, however, until research began to direct its attention towards the reader's own contribution to a successful literary experience. Studies came into focus relating some specific characteristic of the reader to his response (Crossen, 1948; Loban, 1954).

During the 1950's a variety of approaches were made towards establishing an objective, verifiable method of examining response to literature. It was generally agreed that the reader should be free to make his own response, and should not be limited by being required to answer specific questions. It was also suggested that free oral responses are more effective than written ones in capturing a spontaneous reaction (Forman, 1951).

Since then, studies concerned with examining response to literature have done so by analyzing the free oral or written

reactions of the readers. They were mainly exploratory, and were, therefore, diverse in their approach, in their purpose, and in their method of exploration. One such study was that by Squire already referred to.

Taba was one of the first to systematize analysis of the readers' responses into categories of the different kinds found. Squire developed this a little further: he analyzed the responses to identify the psychological process involved in their creation, as well as to establish a framework of types of responses. A second purpose, however, made possible the realization of the first. He designed a method of research which could be used for recording and analyzing the verbalized reactions of readers, both during and at the end of their reading.

Because the method designed by Squire and the types of responses he established comprise the framework of the present study, they are described in some detail.

Design of Squire's Study

Four short stories were each divided into six segments for reading and responding. The device of sectioning the stories, and thereby limiting the responses to only one part of the story at a time, made possible separate analysis of the responses to each section. The total responses to a section were considered to be the "content unit" for each individual, and by analyzing each separately, the development of patterns of responses during the complete reading process could be identified.

The nondirected oral responses were made during individual reading interviews with the investigator. The students were asked to respond freely and completely in describing the "feelings, ideas, opinions, or reactions," which occurred to them while reading or at the end of reading each section (Squire, 1964, p. 16). The interviewer was limited to giving signs of encouragement such as nodding the head, listening intently, or asking such questions as "Do you have any other reactions, feelings or ideas?" and making such comments as, "Oh," or "I see."

The verbalized reactions, which had been recorded on a disc cutter, were transcribed and subjected to content analysis to identify the nature of the responses made in each content unit. Seven kinds or types of responses were revealed, and they were used to code all the responses to the four literary selections.

1. Literary judgments.
2. Interpretational responses.
3. Narrational responses.
4. Associational responses.
5. Self-involvement.
6. Prescriptive judgments.
7. Miscellaneous.

With a few variations the design of the present study, which is described in some detail in Chapter 3, is based on that of Squire. The second division of this chapter, however, indicates both the purpose and the significance of this investigation.

MAJOR QUESTIONS

The main concern of this study is examination of the written transcripts of verbalized reactions of Cree junior high school students, to three literary selections in order to answer the following questions:

1. What evidence has been provided in the oral responses of the subjects of successful comprehension of the literary selections?

2. What evidence has been provided of gaps in their comprehension?

3. What factors may be identified as contributing to difficulties in comprehension?

The existence of a relationship between successful or unsuccessful understanding of literary selections, and the linguistic and experiential background of the readers, although frequently indicated, has rarely been explored.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This investigation is the analysis of the nondirected oral responses of the subjects to three short stories of the kind likely to appear in a junior high school class anthology. The stories selected were "The Doll's House," by Katherine Mansfield, "All the Years of Her Life," by Morley Callaghan, and "The Returning," by Daniel de Paola.

The sample consisted of thirty-nine Cree students enrolled in Grade 8, who were approximately fourteen years of age. The school

chosen was the Ermineskin Indian School in Hobbema.

In order to determine the nature of the reactions evoked during the process of reading the selections, and to do so in the manner established by Squire, the stories were divided into six sections for reading and responding. Immediately after each of the sections had been read silently by the subject, his oral responses were recorded on a tape recorder in an interview situation.

The verbalized reactions were transcribed, and the transcripts segmented into responses as defined by Squire. These were also classified according to Squire's major kinds.

The classified responses were then examined for accuracy of comprehension, and categories of Acceptable, Miscellaneous and Deviant responses were established. After all of the responses had been separated into their respective categories on the basis of comprehension, they were further examined for factors which were apparently inhibiting accurate comprehension.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Since the study of literature is a prescribed part of the language arts curriculum at the junior high school level, it was considered essential to explore difficulties that Cree children might encounter during such an activity.

In addition, teachers need to become familiar with the Indian child's understanding of the linguistic symbols, the translation of which enables him to obtain meaning from the printed page. This is particularly so at the present time, when so many Indian children are

attending provincial schools. This study may assist teachers to understand the problems that atypical children—children from a widely divergent cultural and linguistic background—may have striving to comprehend the reading material provided in the classroom. The child can read such material only in the light of the personal culture which he brings to his reading.

In England, Dixon has firmly denounced the "fallacy" of ignoring the personal culture which the native English child brings to his reading,

> [that] network of attitudes to experience and personal evaluations that he develops in a living response to his family and neighbourhood. (Dixon, 1967, p. 3)

The interplay between the personal world of the child and that of the writer, Dixon considers is such a vital part of the literary experience that it is encumbent upon the teachers of English,

> to acknowledge both sides of the experience and know them both intimately if he is to help bring the two into fruitful relationship. (Dixon, 1967, p. 3)

If a gap in such a relationship is to be avoided, it is important for teachers to be aware of the difficulties which the native Indian student has to overcome in order to reach an understanding of the situation presented by the author.

An educational "gap" has been defined by Tyler as an educational need—a gap between objectives, and the achievement of these objectives (Tyler, 1970, p. 6). Of necessity, however, gaps need to be identified before they can be bridged. Until evidence is provided to the contrary, gaps exist only in theory. This study is significant because it does provide evidence of such gaps.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Although the oral responses of the subjects to the literary selections were classified, it was impossible to include classification of the spontaneous reaction—an essential part of response to literature—evident in the intonation of the responses. The chuckling voice, the sneering voice, the hurt or the angry one, even the giggles and outright laughter had to be ignored since the written transcriptions only of the verbalized reactions were analyzed.

In the second place, in order that the same story could be read on the same day and responded to by the total subject sample, five interviewers were used. This might have introduced a personality factor which could not be controlled. It was hoped, however, that the use of similar nondirective questions to stimulate a response, and the absence of any discussion during the interview procedures lessened the influence of the different personalities. In addition, the subjects quickly recognized the design of the procedure and were soon apparently prepared to talk simply without expecting comments.

OVERVIEW OF THE CHAPTERS

The second chapter of this report presents a review of studies of response to literature, with particular reference to the kinds of misunderstandings and misinterpretations of literary selections already uncovered by previous research.

A detailed description of the design of the present investigation comprises Chapter 3. Modifications of Squire's study, and

reasons for such modifications are clearly explained.

Separation and analysis of the responses in terms of accuracy of comprehension are presented in Chapter 4. Also included is a comparison of categories of Acceptable, Miscellaneous and Deviant responses.

Chapter 5 is concerned primarily with identification and comparison of the kinds of factors which apparently affected the degree of successful comprehension of the selections. Again categories of factors were formulated, and analysis in terms of these factors was described.

A summary of the findings is discussed in the final chapter. In addition, theoretical and practical generalizations and implications are pointed out, and a few ways of extending this type of investigation have been suggested.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Relevant studies of related literature are presented in four groups according to a related focus of attention. The main areas of concern are: (1) misunderstandings and misinterpretations, (2) the background of the reader, (3) the personality of the reader, and (4) dimensions of response.

Studies of Misunderstandings and Misinterpretations

One of the original studies of response to literature was that reported by Richards in 1929. It had been undertaken for the purpose of establishing a rationale for literary criticism, and was, therefore, not primarily concerned with reaction as such. It is included in this review because it still exerts considerable influence on educational theory (Richards, 1966).

The study undertaken with advanced students of English at Cambridge University, was an analysis of the total content of their written interpretation of thirteen poems by well-known poets. However, to ensure that the responses were evoked entirely by the literary works, knowledge of their authorship was withheld.

Richards reported that without some previous knowledge of the identity of the poet, the poetry itself became "a remote, mysterious, unmanageable thing" to a large majority of the readers (Richards, 1966, p. 291). In addition, the lack of adequate literary experience severely hindered the ability of the readers to recognize and respond to the tone and intention of the poet. Such recognition was

considered an indispensable requirement for the reading of poetry.

Richards described those misinterpretations that he was able to identify, and indicated both the nature of the gaps, and the lack of adequate preparation on the part of the students which caused them. Of the sixteen sources of difficulty he uncovered, the six which appear to be relevant to the present study are presented here, and their explanation paraphrased.

1. Immaturity: A lack of general experience of life was evident in the erratic opinions given.
2. Lack of adequate reading experiences: This was evident in the comparisons and identifications made which were the results of naivety and poverty of poetic literary experience.
3. Defective translating: This was most evident, and was caused by inability to interpret complex and unfamiliar meanings.
4. Stock responses: These were inappropriate and seemed to be based on the principle of making a minimum effort through using an acquired response.
5. Preconceptions: As well as being inappropriate the response would seem to have resulted from frustrating mental exercise.
6. Bewilderment: This is the product of despair and hardly a response; it was evident that the reader was totally unprepared for the encounter.

It may be noticed that in the above summary of Richards'

findings, the gaps are shown to be, at the same time, both a cause and an effect—the original cause in each case being a lack of adequate knowledge and experience. They could even be summarized as insufficient linguistic knowledge and experience, insufficient literary knowledge and experience, an insufficient store of relevant experiences, and inappropriate attitudes and habits of mind.

This unpreparedness prevented the readers from interpreting and responding to the poetry at the intellectual and emotional levels of understanding. The result, of course, was misinterpretation of the poet's thoughts and ideas.

A study by Cross had as its purpose the uncovering of "deep-seated" causes of failure to understand the reading material. It took the form of a classroom unit entitled "Introduction to Literature," and was conducted at Menlo Junior College, California (Cross, 1940, pp. 366-70).

The class was required to read four poems and then to write their own interpretation of each of them as they had understood it. The written answers were read aloud by the students, and discussed in the classroom, with particular reference to what seemed to have been misunderstood, and what might have been the cause of the misunderstanding.

The four main reasons, found by Cross, for failure of the students to get "generally-agreed-upon meanings," were:

1. The influence of family and home life.
2. The influence of previous experiences.
3. Confusion in the meanings of words.

4. Inattention because of belief in the truth of the printed word. (Cross, 1940, p. 366)

Misunderstandings such as these show the great influence on a reader, of previous personal experiences. And while it is undoubtedly true that the experiences which a student brings to the classroom may lead to "misinterpretation," it is the inevitable result of not having had experiences of the kind that would enable him to cope with the work assigned.

The significance of language is determined by habitual associations; and the reader's ability to get any meaning at all from what he reads "is dependent upon the associations that are aroused" (Gray, 1956, p. 73). The inevitability of readers possessing only associated meanings, would seem to have been lost in the strongly-worded finding that,

> meanings themselves are frequently twisted and distorted because students see them through the obscure glass of their own background. (Cross, 1940, p. 366)

Causes of "misunderstanding" and "misinterpretation" are in the very life-blood of the readers; and are, as Cross concludes, "more deep-seated than teachers may believe" (Cross, 1940, p. 366). When no experience is aroused, however, which could be associated with "generally-agreed-upon meanings," students are forced to rely on their own connotative meaning. "Meanings" are formed only by habitual association of a word with events within the reader's own experiences (Allen, 1964, p. 422). Nothing, therefore, has meaning of itself.

Background of the Reader

The influence of home and family life on a reader's understanding of the material provided has also been previously explored. Meckel conducted one such study in 1946, and a second was conducted by Forman in 1951.

Meckel undertook the analysis of the written responses of 96 senior college students, to a novel dealing with various aspects of family life. He hypothesized that the nature of the response to the stimulus of the reading material would be influenced by the following five factors:

1. The reader's mental set—his expectations.
2. The skill with which a reader is able to read. This involves, (a) his ability to follow a story and grasp the main ideas and details, and (b) his ability to grasp the significance of the symbolic and metaphorical aspects of the content.
3. The reader's past experiences. The potentiality of those incidents which happen to be the kind the reader has lived through, as sources of satisfaction or dissatisfaction, lies in their associational value.
4. The reader's values and attitudes towards the particular area of experience with which the book deals.
5. The reader's preoccupations. (Meckel, 1946, pp. 51-3)

The novel used was Fortitude by Hugh Walpole, chosen because the content was considered to bear some relationship to the preoccupations of young adults; and analysis was for the purpose of identifying

factors which had influenced the nature, or the quality of the experience evoked.

Two very important observations were made by Meckel concerning factors, other than the reading material, which contributed towards a literary experience—whether satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

He noted in the first place, that a reader remembers most vividly those experiences which are the most significant, or meaningful to him. This finding would suggest that observation of the reader's references would indicate his focus of attention.

Secondly, due to identification with the central character, the desire for a happy ending is a natural trait for adolescents. They like a story to follow a success pattern, and find it difficult to accept one that does not. In addition, they do not like being left at the end of a story, with happiness or success implied by the author; they wish to know exactly what had happened. This is the result, according to Meckel, of concern for the main character, and the wholehearted way they live vicariously through the novel (Meckel, 1946, p. 26).

Factors, found by Meckel, which seemed to have affected the responses were, (a) lack of experience in responding to the techniques of the author, and (b) failure to distinguish between the factual and metaphorical aspects of the story.

Literal-mindedness, such as this, had also been remarked upon by Cross (Cross, 1940, p. 369), and Richards (Richards, 1966, pp. 182-195). It was suggested by Meckel, that this important factor, influencing the comprehension of literary materials, needs to be given greater attention (Meckel, 1946, p. 189).

Finally, Meckel reported considerable evidence of selection and rejection, with a vivid response aroused by an incident related to a satisfying personal experience. There was, however, a tendency to reject parts of a story related to experiences associated with emotional tension (Meckel, 1946, pp. 91-3).

The second study examined is the one by Forman conducted with students from grades seven and eight. Nine of the original group of forty-six were classified as "non-comprehenders," and their responses were not included (Forman, 1951). The final sample, therefore, consisted of thirty-seven subjects.

The purpose of the research was to learn the nature of the subjects' reactions to three literary selections. Nevertheless, the method used was an examination of the responses of the readers to specific questions about their reading. This method would, in fact, limit the nature of the subjects' reactions within the boundary of the questions, even though the questions were answered freely in an interview situation.

While Meckel's study had shown that a reader selects what he takes from his reading, Forman found that the subjects seemed to extract more than had been supplied by the author. He found also, that they added something from their own experience in their interpretation of what they read.

Both of these findings exemplify Harding's belief of the dual role of the reader of fiction—both that of a participant, and that of an observer (Harding, 1962, pp. 133-147). As a spectator, the reader also remembers past experiences aroused by incidents in the

story. He can, as well, anticipate imaginatively what happens later.

Forman's final observation was that "part of what a child gets from a story, will depend on what he brings to it" (Forman, 1951, p. 6). This confirms Dixon's opinion of the significance of "the interplay" between the world of the child, and that of the writer, for a successful literary experience. But Forman's own conclusion is, perhaps, greater confirmation. He notes that a reader,

> makes use of his culture, his training, his habits, and all his experience to interpret what is on the printed page. (Forman, 1951, p. 1)

This is, perhaps, one of the most important observations made so far regarding examination of responses for "misunderstandings" and "misinterpretations."

Personality of the Reader

Using the technique of analyzing free, written responses, Loban examined the relationship between sensitivity to the feelings of others, and responses evoked by specially selected works of fiction (Loban, 1954). His sample of 376 students, enrolled in classes from grade eight to grade twelve, was representative of all walks of life, and of a variety of ethnic and religious groups. The stories selected all involved values based on human dignity.

The sensitivity of each member of the group was measured, and he was rated as having a "high" or "low" degree of sensitivity as indicated by the scale of measurement.

The subjects, widely distributed in their normal school environment, listened to a total of ten stories read to them, over a period of time, by their classroom teachers. They then wrote their reactions

to them. The responses of the sixty with the highest sensitivity rating, and the sixty with the lowest, were subjected to special analysis for the purpose of the study.

As well as establishing a relationship between the reader's degree of social sensitivity and his responses to the stories, Loban discovered gaps in understanding and interpretation. These gaps were held responsible for inhibiting a satisfactory relationship between the reader and the selection. The idea that possible damage could result from an indiscriminate pairing off of a child and a text, was also clearly indicated.

Based on the 1200 essays of the decidedly heterogeneous group, Loban identified general tendencies of adolescents, which are summarized here. They are followed by remarks or comments based on linguistic theory.

1. The least sensitive want to blame someone. This often resulted from stories in which there was no appealing character with whom to identify.
2. Almost all adolescents miss important implications. There was overwhelming evidence that they mention only the most obvious points of the story.
3. Many readers express superficial concepts. Many responses seemed to be verbal moralizing, stimulated by certain events in the story.
4. Few knew what to say about literature. Attempts at literary criticism were often ready-made formulas expressing their elders' viewpoints.

5. The most sensitive have the most to say. Repeatedly members of the less sensitive group indicated their failure to understand the story, the meaning of the action, or the motivation of the characters.
6. Adolescents do not welcome new concepts. There was preference for stories that were "exciting" or "funny"; but a resistance to those which required reflection, or contained ideas contrary to their own expectations or attitudes.
7. Adolescents do not relate religious values to literary values. Formal religious statements did not enter the subjects' responses.
8. Adolescents favor stories within the range of their intellectual or emotional maturity. Those which require subtle understandings will exact skill on the part of the teacher.

Loban emphasized this last finding as one of the most important for teachers to observe; it is, in fact, inclusive of the tendencies that precede it.

Every study mentioned so far has referred to the inability of young readers to understand meanings implied in the stories. Need for greater familiarity with this literary technique is clearly indicated. Recognition and response to it depend upon a functional knowledge of the inferential aspect of language, and on recognition of the linguistic and cultural cues. If the use of idiom is not a functional part of a reader's linguistic behaviour, he can scarcely be expected to

recognize both its use and its specific meaning, during the process of reading.

In the same way, implied and inferred meanings would need to play a functional role in the language habits of the reader, before he could be expected to recognize their use, and "translate" their meaning. Gray has shown the need for "carefully planned guidance" in this subtle use of language (Gray, 1956, pp. 69-70). Yet, in fact, literature might be the only "context of situation" where such use is found (Malinowski, 1964, p. 310). In order that readers be enabled to develop the necessary skills and "habits of mind," this use of language, both in speech and in writing, would need to have been introduced long before the junior or senior high school grades.

With regards the use of "ready-made formulas" this tendency of adolescents might spring from the reader's inability to articulate his ideas concerning the literary qualities of a selection, or from involvement in the story to the exclusion of attending to its literary qualities. But it is more likely to be the result of attempting literary criticism with an inadequate knowledge of the literary techniques used. Whether literary criticism should be expected of high school students remains a controversial issue, particularly since literary criticism and literary evaluation are quite different aspects of reading and understanding literature (Wellek and Warren, 1956, p. 19).

A third point arising from Loban's observations is the resistance encountered to certain types of literature. Readers bring to the printed page, and use, knowledge and experience they already possess to interpret what they find there. It might be expected that a

challenge to ways of looking at life, established through habitual patterns of behaviour, will meet with resistance. Most readers depend heavily on their own empirical knowledge when looking at new concepts or new values. More experience of life is needed before young readers finally relinquish the tendency to view all behaviour in the light of values conditioned, partly, by their personal culture.

And lastly, although Meckel has shown the need of adolescents to become concerned with the main character, it is not always realized that when some kind of "feeling with" the characters is not evoked, an intellectual or critical attitude may be adopted. The reader's role becomes that of an observer. (Squire, 1956, pp. 200-220), or a spectator (Harding, 1962).

Literature is a social activity, taking place in a setting provided by the author. The reader may be completely disinterested, in which case there would be no comment, good or bad. Or he may be sufficiently interested to take a stand. He may even reach such a degree of objective, imaginative involvement as to try to identify "a tragic flaw" in the characters, or try to establish responsibility for the direction of the action.

All of the tendencies of adolescents summarized above serve to demonstrate the individual and personal nature of response to literature.

Dimensions of Response

Two studies identify the kinds of reactions experienced by the readers; the first is Squire's, the design of which has already been

described (Squire, 1956), and the second is Wilson's (Wilson, 1966).

Squire analyzed the oral responses of fifty-two ninth and tenth grade students of approximately fifteen years of age, who were enrolled for a summer session at the University of California.

Responses of the subjects to four short stories were recorded in an interview situation, and methods of analyzing and coding the responses were devised which would reflect their pattern of development during the complete process of reading a story.

Seven kinds of responses were identified, but the patterns were of an individual rather than of a group nature, and there was greater variability in some kinds of response than in others. After the patterns of response had been examined in relation to the intelligence and reading ability of the subjects, it was found that the quality of individual interpretations was not related to these characteristics.

Internal analysis of the transcripts uncovered the following six sources of difficulty:

1. Failure to grasp the meaning. While a reasonable comprehension is basic to understanding a work of fiction, some readers experienced difficulty in grasping the essential intention of the author.
2. Reliance on stock responses. Of all the distortions and misconceptions occurring, one was the reliance on familiar and stereotyped patterns of thinking.
3. Happiness binding. Many readers seemed to be incorrigible romantics, unwilling to face unpleasant interpretations.

4. Critical predispositions. There were two main fixations; concern for "true to life" situations, and concern for "good description," which were clearly acquired concerns.
5. Irrelevant associations. These dislocated the sequence of response to literature.
6. Search for certainty. Some readers felt compelled to achieve a complete understanding of characters and events, while others felt compelled to infer the motivation behind the characters' actions. (Squire, 1964, pp. 37-49)

A very important generalization made by Squire was formulated in relation to the first difficulty described. He made the point that "a reasonable comprehension is basic to understanding a work of fiction." For this to be achieved, however, "generally-agreed-upon meanings" of key words, and recognition of the author's implied meanings should be part of a reader's "stock in trade." Such knowledge comprises his essential equipment as a reader.

Nevertheless, not only in Squire's study, but in most of those reviewed in this report, the absence of basic linguistic knowledge has been indicated. It did not seem to have been realized, however, that this is the really significant cause of misunderstanding and misinterpretation. As a result various kinds of substitutions, which are at the same time the effect of a lack of adequate understanding and the cause of further misunderstandings, are projected into the reading of the stories.

The remaining five difficulties reported were related to Squire's specific sample, and therefore not necessarily of a general

nature. They occasionally resulted, according to Squire, in minor errors in interpretation, which affected only slightly the reader's understanding of the story. Sometimes, however, the result was "gross distortions" of the actual meaning of the stories.

Although one might expect an exact relationship to exist between a sign and its meaning, one cannot altogether ignore "the intermediary interpreter" of the sign (Allen, 1964, p. 421). In other words, "actual meanings" exist only as they are perceived; and while it is not the intention of the investigator to suggest that, therefore, any kind of illogical interpretation should be acceptable, it is her intention to suggest that if "gross distortions" are the outcome of a student's logical interpretation, then examination of his background of knowledge and experience would be indicated. Providing literature which exacts of its readers knowledge and experience they do not possess creates a framework for conceptual errors, and "failure to grasp the meaning" of the story.

Since an accumulation of inaccurate interpretations is bound to affect a reader's just evaluation of a story, Squire suggests that adolescent readers need assistance in learning to interpret literature (Squire, 1964, p. 54). However, in order of priority, it would seem that "a reasonable comprehension" precedes interpretation, and an accurate interpretation precedes a valid response.

Wilson used Squire's design, and his categories of response (Wilson, 1966). Three novels were read by fifty-four students in two freshman English classes at San Francisco College. Their nondirected written responses were examined in the light of Squire's major kinds,

both before and after discussion of the novels.

The purpose of Wilson's investigation was to discover if the study of literature in the classroom influenced the way the students responded to it. The results showed that, in fact, discussion did change the responses both statistically and qualitatively. With regards to statistics, after the novels had been read and discussed, there were fewer literary judgments, less retelling of the story details, more interpretations, and fewer self-involvement responses. Wilson concluded, therefore, that while intensive study of literature will increase the interpretational facility of the students, it will also result in "a concommitant loss of empathy with the work" (Wilson, 1966, p. 41).

Wilson also presented what he termed "a puzzling negative finding in the misinterpretation of literature" (Wilson, 1966, p. 38), that very few of the sources of difficulty enumerated by Squire were to be found in the responses of his investigation, which was, of course, conducted with older subjects than Squire's. He did not deny that the responses included "uniquely patterned responses," and "individual interpretations which differed from those offered by competent critics"; but found it difficult to show that they were based on either "misreading," or on "stock responses." Nor was he prepared to presume that responses of subjects who gave rein to sentiment were caused by "generalized or distorted sentimental emotions." Finally, he felt that the objection of subjects to a book because it did not have a happy ending was based on "more complex grounds than simply that of being 'happiness bound'" (Wilson, 1966, p. 39).

What Wilson would seem to be saying in the above findings is that the real causes of misunderstanding cannot be dismissed at a critical level. They need deeper probing, since

> even obvious misunderstandings caused by vocabulary deficiencies . . . involve complicated issues. (Wilson, 1966, p. 40)

He suggested, in addition, that "analysis of received responses" would be more useful for the purpose of identifying causes of difficulty, than would analysis for the purpose of comparison of difficulties.

Thus it would seem that for the purpose of providing numerical scores, Squire's method was successful in what it proposed to do—it did identify the psychological processes involved in making a response to literature.

It did not, however, clearly identify factors affecting the interaction itself between the reader and his text. On the one hand categories of response presumes the ability of the reader to comprehend the reading material. But on the other hand, internal analysis of the responses uncovered various causes of difficulty in comprehension. This would suggest that many categorized responses were, in fact, deviant responses—responses indicating that what had been understood by the reader was not what had been intended by the writer. Such a situation would detract validity from the numerical findings, and give more value, for educational purposes at least, to the internal analysis, and the difficulties it uncovered.

While not fitting exactly into the classification of "Dimensions of Response," a study which examined comprehension—the point of

interaction—as being a vital part of any investigation into successful or unsuccessful reading experiences might be mentioned here. The study by Jenkinson, relating as it does any reaction—intellectual or emotional—to the background knowledge of the subjects, is a more subtle kind of study concerned with response. The points of interaction were identified as the points of recognition, and factors indicated, which give shape to a response (Jenkinson, 1957).

These factors include: (1) familiarity, or lack of it, with the vocabulary and the syntax of the English language, (2) familiarity, or lack of it, with word attack skills, with the conventions of the written language, and with the author's stylistic techniques, and (3) association of previous personal experience, which either enriched or prevented an accurate understanding of the material.

Nevertheless, although it had been generally agreed by investigators that barriers to comprehension such as those found in studies of response to literature were the result of deeply-rooted factors in the background of the individuals, the factors themselves were rarely identified. Yet such factors need to be identified if studies of response are to become educationally useful, and programs directed at progress in reading and understanding literature are to be planned.

The barriers to comprehension already uncovered by previous research include:

1. Insufficient literary scholarship.
2. Insufficient experience with the reading of literature.
3. Insufficient experience with the inferential use of language.

4. Insufficient knowledge of the meanings of words as they were used in the selections.
5. Insufficient associated meanings for the words used in the selections.
6. Lack of sensitivity.
7. Set ways of thinking.
8. Ideas and values based on personal culture.
9. Avoidance of what is unpleasant or unfamiliar.
10. Insufficient relevant experiences, real or vicarious.

As a result of becoming conversant with the nature of the gaps found to exist between the interpretation of literature by non-Indian readers on the one hand, and the works themselves on the other, the shape of the present study evolved. A detailed description of its design, which uses Squire's method of collecting the data, and his classification of the responses, is presented in the following chapter.

Chapter 3

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The design of Squire's study is the foundation and the framework of the present study. Replication of it had been attempted, but exact replication proved to be neither possible nor practical. Three phases of the design of this study are described below, and an explanation given for each deviation from that of Squire. The three phases are, (1) a description of the preparation needed for the study, and of the collection of the data, (2) an explanation of the initial treatment of the data, and (3) modification of the design.

COLLECTION OF THE DATA

Before an investigation could take place of the nature proposed, it was necessary to select the subjects, the stories, and the interviewers. Following is the description of how these selections were made.

Selection of the Subjects

Forty students enrolled in Grade eight, and attending the Ermineskin Indian School in Hobbema, were selected for the study.

No attempt was made to include an equal number of boys and girls, since a limited age range seemed to be a more important criterion of selection. There were then twenty-six girls and fourteen boys, all of whom were approximately fourteen years old. Their actual ages ranged from thirteen years and four months to fifteen

years and three months.

In the same way, no attention was paid to either intelligence or reading ability, the only criteria for selection being age and grade level.

One of the original number did not complete the interviews for all three stories. The final sample, then, was thirty-nine subjects.

Of this group, nine were boarders, in semipermanent residence at the school. The remaining thirty were representative of the four Indian bands which occupy the Bull, the Ermineskin, the Samson and the Montana reservations. This situation, however, was not a stable one. The day-school students would sometimes become boarders, and vice versa except for three subjects who were permanently in foster care. They remained in residence at the school throughout the school year.

Selection and Treatment of the Stories

In order to keep to a minimum disruption of the normal school timetable, three rather than four short stories were used. The choice of stories was not a simple undertaking, since it was intended that only such stories as would be likely to appear in a class anthology should be used. Consideration, then, needed to be given to the quality, as literature, of those that were selected. After a considerable time had been spent trying to choose three from among the hundreds that could qualify to be chosen, selection was made in the following way.

It was considered important to give some consideration to the

theme of the stories, and in the absence of any previous knowledge of student interest, stories with a universal theme were sought.

Rudman had noted that adolescents are concerned with their personal problems (Rudman, 1955, p. 505), and that was a factor Squire had had in mind when making his selection. It was, then, decided to use at least one of the stories chosen by Squire, and the one selected was Morley Callaghan's "All the Years of Her Life." It was thought that its theme—a thoughtless youngster attempting to, and finally managing to achieve real independence—would be applicable to any group of adolescents.

The second story chosen was Katherine Mansfield's "The Doll's House." It was included partly because it had been discussed at a graduate seminar at the University of Alberta, partly because it had been found in the same anthology as Callaghan's story (ed. Donohue and McIntosh, repr. 1964), and partly because it was anticipated that its background of discrimination, snobbery and social distance would be recognized by the subjects in spite of its setting in England.

The final story was to have an Indian as the protagonist, but its selection proved to be more difficult than had been expected. Indian stories were available; the difficulty lay in choosing one which, for certain, would not embarrass, degrade, or offend the subjects, particularly since they are so adept at hiding their real feelings. Many stories were read before it was decided to have native students themselves make the choice.

Stories, or selections from stories were read and discussed by

native students resident in Edmonton who were attending the University of Alberta for special tuition. Others were read and discussed by a group of grade ten students at the Indian Residential School near Edmonton; and still others were read and discussed by a few grade ten students at Ermineskin School.

Finally, the three stories which had evoked the most positive response were given to Indian students attending the Junior High School in Ponoka, to be rated in order of preference. The one that proved to be the most popular was "The Returning" by Daniel de Paola. This story had been published originally in The Prairie Schooner (1964, pp. 1-13). It was later selected by a program committee in the United States for inclusion in what was termed a "Prep Program"—stories to be studied in the junior high school as a preparation for more serious literature study in the senior high school.

The stories finally selected were: (1) "The Doll's House," (2) "All the Years of Her Life," and (3) "The Returning." And because that was the order in which they were read, they are subsequently referred to as Story No. 1, Story No. 2, and Story No. 3.

Each of the stories was divided into six sections to be read silently by the individual subjects. As each section was completed, it was discussed in an interview situation according to the format described on pages 41-42.

The stories, divided into their appropriate sections, have been included in Appendix A.

Selection of Interviewers

Squire had himself conducted the interviews reported in his study. Those reported here were conducted by five interviewers—three males and two females—registered in the Intercultural Program at the University of Alberta. They had all had some experience working with native students, and it was expected, therefore, that they would be empathic towards the young Indian subjects taking part in the study.

After a few weeks, however, sudden bereavement caused the withdrawal of one member of the team, and she recommended a close friend to take her place. Since the appointment of students to interviewers was randomized for each story, any possible difference in the relationship between the subjects and the fifth member of the team, was minimized.

This, then, was the second variation introduced into the design of the present study, the first being the use of three, rather than four, short stories.

Criteria for Interviewing

The two main purposes for the interviewers to have in mind were:

1. To encourage the subjects to respond as completely as possible.
2. To have them state as clearly as possible what they were trying to express.

Both of these objectives, however, were to be achieved without any specific questions asked, or directions given.

Encouragement could be given by such devices as nodding the head, listening intently to what was being explained, or by such non-directive comments as, "Oh," "I see," and "Uh-hum."

A certain amount of probing was allowed in order to clarify a subject's response and thus assist in the analysis of the responses. Such probing, nevertheless, was to be non-directive. It could take the form of asking such questions as, "I wonder why?", "Can you explain a little more clearly?" or "Do you have anything to add to that remark?" It could, too, be a restatement in the form of a question, of the subject's comments.

Meetings with the interviewers were arranged during which the techniques used for non-directive interviewing, as described by Cannell and Kahn (ed. Festinger and Katz, 1953, pp. 327-79), were discussed. Later meetings included junior and senior high school native students resident in Edmonton, and the interviewers were given the opportunity to practice their techniques.

Interview Procedures

On the days arranged for the data to be collected, the subjects were assigned at random to their respective interviewers. The following standard procedures were followed at each interview.

A secluded area in the school was made available to each interviewer. He had in his possession a tape-recorder ready for use, and mimeographed copies of the six sections of that day's story.

In order to minimize pupil interaction, the same story was read by the total sample, and their reactions recorded, on the same day.

That meant that two subjects at a time were available to each interviewer, the one reading a section of the story outside, while the other responded orally inside the interview area.

The six sections of the story were read separately, and after each section the subject made his own non-directed comments. These were recorded on the tape-recorder. However, in order to ensure that the interviews were each conducted in a similar manner, and to eliminate as much as possible the personality factor, the following brief format was introduced.

At each meeting the subject gave his name as soon as the tape-recorder was turned on. This was considered advisable since there was almost no time between one subject's interview and the next. Although the responses of individual subjects were made on alternate tracks of the tape, this precaution was a great help to the transcriber.

After the subject had given his name, the interviewer asked such questions as "What can you tell me about this part of the story? What does it make you think about or feel?" A little variety with regards to the actual words used could be introduced at the discretion of the interviewer, but there were to be no direct questions, either about the content of the story, or the subject's reaction to it.

The subject then told what he had noticed in the story, how he felt about it, and whatever other thoughts had crossed his mind while reading. When he indicated that he had nothing further to say, the interviewer summarized what he understood had been said so far, and the subject was allowed to make a correction or an addition if he so wished.

The initial interview. For the initial reading interview each subject was introduced to his interviewer and they chatted easily for a few minutes about anything of interest. This introduction was repeated with each new subject throughout the day, and the relationship established during the brief introductory period was probably an important factor in securing the excellent rapport between subjects and interviewers, which lasted throughout the entire visit to the school. The informal chat was followed by an explanation by the interviewer of the way the interviews would be conducted. The subject was then given the first section of Story No. 1 to read silently outside the interview area.

Succeeding interviews. The succeeding interviews followed essentially the same pattern as the first, except that there was no need for introductions, nor for an explanation of the method of procedure. Up to and including the last one, however, the same format was repeated, and no further directions were given.

The verbalized reactions, thus recorded on the tape-recorder, were later transcribed and segmented into units of measurement for placement into the kinds of responses established by Squire.

TREATMENT OF THE DATA

The second part of this chapter is divided into two sections: (1) a description of the way the content units of each total transcript were segmented into units of measurement, or recording units; and (2) a description of how they were separated into classified reactions.

Division into Recording Units

The entire series of utterances made to a single section of a story was what constituted a "content unit." For the three stories, then, there were eighteen content units from each subject, making 702 from the total group. These needed to be divided into recording units, and a slight deviation from Squire's definition of a unit of measurement was introduced.

Squire's definition of a recording unit. Squire had defined a recording unit as "a single theme or idea." As well as indicating that it be "the smallest unit which seemed to convey the sense of a single idea," he had described it in structural terms which would seem to fit the traditional definition of a simple sentence (Squire, 1956, pp. 352-3). For the purpose of Squire's study—a comparison of the numerical count of each kind of psychological reaction to the stories—a unit capable of limiting the nature of the reaction was required. But in a study whose primary concern is to uncover factors which would seem to have affected the comprehension of the material read, greater cognizance needed to be given to meaning than to structure. The following description of a recording unit was, therefore, used.

The recording unit used in this study. As well as finding ideas expressed in simple sentence structures, others were found in structures which were long and involved. In addition, causal relationships were frequently implied, or even inseparably fused into a single main thought or idea. Were such expressions broken down into their

components, meaningless fragments would result in the first case, and in the second, the established relationship would disappear, and the "idea" contained within the response would be destroyed. Each of the above kinds of structure, then, was counted as a single recording unit, and the content units were divided into recording units ready for classification.

Division into Classified Reactions

Seven main kinds of reactions had been identified by Squire (Squire, 1956, pp. 354-9), and they will be described next, since examination of the recording units was made according to his directions for coding the responses.

1. Literary judgments. These included direct or implied comments on any of the specific elements of the story—style, characterization or plot—as well as value judgments of the story, or of the author's presentation of ideas.
2. Interpretational responses. Reactions in which attempts were made to search for deeper meanings were classed as interpretational responses. They included generalizations concerning the nature or the motivation of the characters, and reactions to ideas expressed or implied.
3. Narrational reactions. These were reactions in which the reader repeated words, details or events without attempting to interpret them, in order to grasp what was happening in the story.
4. Associational. The reader associated characters, events

and incidents with his own experience, real or vicarious. He may also have associated characters with persons other than himself.

5. Self-involvement. Association of the reader with the behaviour or emotional reactions of the characters was placed here. Also included in this classification were reactions indicating approval of, or attachment to a character, or disapproval or rejection.

6. Prescriptive judgments. The expression of personal convictions on behaviour, based on fixed and absolute standards, which conveyed a sense of inflexibility were classified here.

7. Miscellaneous. All other reactions which could not be classified as any of the kinds previously described were considered to be miscellaneous.

While it was sometimes difficult to fit the above descriptions to all of the verbalized reactions of the present study, it was usually possible to identify the type of response being made. Following, however, are some of the kinds of reactions found in the data. They are not representative of any single story or section of a story; nor of any single transcript, or content unit from a transcript. Nevertheless, although the classification can be identified, it will be seen that the responses are deviant responses. They could never have been made by one thoroughly familiar with both the oral and written codes of the English language, and the personal culture exemplified in the stories.

1. Literary Judgments

(a) Story No. 1

> "The person who wrote this story sure can't spell good. They capital the 'o' in 'Our,' or they put a 'u' in 'or'."

There was evident confusion between the correct, but unfamiliar term of affection, "Our Else," used only by the author, and the more familiar, "or else."

(b) Story No. 2

> "I was wondering why they had to make a description of Mrs. Higgins when it wasn't important."

The description of Mrs. Higgins was an important clue to her feeling of anxiety in spite of her apparent calmness and composure.

(c) Story No. 3

> "The story's good because the way they put the sentences together."

Generally, when literary criticism was attempted it was vague or inarticulate. The above examples were taken from a comparatively small number of this type of response.

2. Interpretational Responses

(a) Story No. 1

> "And the others said that they were the daughters of a jailbird and a washerwoman. I guess they're just saying it because they're jealous of the girls because they do most of the work. Well, they can't do as well as Isabel and that other girl. Well, they go from house to house helping the mothers that work."

"Isabel and that other girl" must refer to Lil Kelvey and her little sister. It was Mrs. Kelvey, not the girls who did the work. She was a washerwoman, and the kind of work she did rather than arousing jealousy, was one of the reasons for the two Kelvey girls being "shunned."

(b) Story No. 2

> "He's stealing, and her mother doesn't say anything. Well, this woman doesn't mind his son stealing, and all that."

Mrs. Higgins' pleasant, dignified manner was misinterpreted; and, as in many reactions to this story, the form of the gender of the personal pronoun, particularly in the genitive case, has been confused.

(c) Story No. 3

> "He didn't want to go back to the reservation because he didn't want to bear the shame—when he killed that man."

The Indian had "jumped the reservation" because he regarded life there as "shameful bondage." He did not want to go back because he would feel "like a prisoner brought back to his prison." The meaning of "shameful bondage" was not known, and the simile not recognized.

3. Narrational Reactions

(a) Story No. 1

> "There was only one school in the town and they had to mix. And they didn't really mix. They were going to make a line, so that they might really mix."

The above example shows the subject's literal understanding of the idiom, "But a line has to be drawn somewhere. It was drawn at the Kelveys."

(b) Story No. 2

> "He [Alfred] was looking in Mr. Carr's coat, and Mr. Carr fired him. He was goin' a fire him 'cause he was looking in his pocket when he wasn't looking at him."

Alfred put his own hand into his own pocket and "with his eyes never meeting Sam Carr's eyes," he took out the stolen articles.

(c) Story No. 3

> "He was thirsty, and he couldn't eat very much because his throat was real dry, and he couldn't eat."

It was days since the Indian had had any food. He was so thirsty, and his throat was so dry, that he couldn't swallow.

4. Associational

(a) Story No. 1

> "They [the Kelveys] were enemies of the children—some children. They don't mix with the children. It made me think of another story. In my school life something happened like that. Well, George _____'s brothers always go alone, always stay away from others."

The Kelveys were "shunned by everybody" and were not even allowed "to mix." They did not "stay away from others" from their own choice.

(b) Story No. 2

> "It reminds me of a Jerry Lewis show, that's what it reminds me of. And that's all I can think of—just that it was funny."

Whatever feelings might have been aroused by Alfred's immaturity, the anxiety he caused his mother could not reasonably be associated with an incident that was considered "funny." Mrs. Higgins' real concern for her son, and the unhappiness he caused, could not have been recognized.

(c) Story No. 3

> "To me it doesn't make sense. Well, a person who's like this, he wouldn't help the woman and the child. I got the silly feeling that it just doesn't go right, because my own dad's like that, and he doesn't help my mum or anything."

Evidence that the Indian had great sympathy towards suffering had been shown earlier in the story. This clue—a slight foreshadowing—had been missed; and the Indian was, therefore, associated wrongly with one who apparently did not share his nature.

5. Self-involvement

(a) Story No. 1

> "In the last part, about the Kelvey children, I feel glad for them because they are excited—because somebody found a long rope for them to skip—because they never skipped before."

The other little girls had been cruel to the Kelvey

girls. It was they who were exercizing away their guilt, and "never did they skip so high" as on that morning.

(b) Story No. 2

> "I feel sorry for the boy because nobody seems to care for him—what he does, or what happens to him. His mother and Mr. Carr, I think they're both against him."

In the section of the story which had evoked the above response, Mr. Carr said that he had intended calling the police, and really ought to do that. Mrs. Higgins agreed, but suggested that a little good advice might do her son more good, and asked to be allowed to take Alfred home. There is no justification for the statements made concerning the attitude of Mr. Carr and Mrs. Higgins.

(c) Story No. 3

> "This man, he took the horse in, and he fixed him up with some Kerosene which he soaked with a cloth. I think the man was very nice to bring the horse in."

Dust had entered through the open door, not a horse. There was no horse. The word "house" had been read as "horse," and he—the horse—became the referent of various pronouns in the story. That a house was involved at all was due to the subject's observation that there was "no smoke from the chimney," and "the door was ajar." The people who were fixed up with "kerosene

soaked with a cloth," were a sick woman and her baby.

6. Prescriptive Judgments

(a) Story No. 1

> "And the teacher especially has a special smile and a special voice for them. Why can't she do that to the other children?"

The author's use of the word "special" in this context was to suggest the teacher's insincerity; and while she did use "a special voice" when speaking to the Kelveys, the "special smile" was for the other children in the classroom.

(b) Story No. 2

> "I think Mrs. Higgins should act to be ashamed that his son was stealing in the drugstore, but he didn't."

If anyone should "act to be ashamed," surely it was Alfred, but we are told that he was not ashamed, just frightened.

(c) Story No. 3

> "The Indian shouldn't have lied about his name. The woman thought he was a good man."

The Indian did not simply lie about his name. He gave as his, the name of an admired, and brave ancestor, it is true; but he also took upon himself the role and identity of his ancestor, as well as his name—hence the ambiguity of the character; hence the title of the story. To have missed this vital clue—clearly implied—is to have missed the meaning of the story.

All of the errors quoted above are the result of "translating, fusing meanings, and reorganizing experiences;" they are responses to literature, and their very nature, therefore, is "recognizing, remembering, understanding relationships and realizing significances," as well as "feeling either pleasure or displeasure" (Pollock, 1965, p. 37). Yet all of this activity would seem to have resulted in, or resulted from "misunderstandings" and "misinterpretations."

It has been pointed out by Jenkinson that,

> the whole basis of either intellectual or emotional reaction must ultimately depend on the ability of the reader to gain ideas or concepts from the selection—in other words comprehend. (Jenkinson, 1957, p. 12)

Conceptual errors such as those contained in the examples quoted above, would seem to indicate, however, that the subjects did not comprehend. They provide evidence of "gaps" between the knowledge and experiential background "assumed by the writer to be shared by the reader" (Sherwin, 1956, p. 321), and what was actually possessed by the subjects.

Nevertheless, the classified reactions were counted, and the results tabulated. They may be seen in Table 1 on page 53. The percentages of the total response, made according to each of Squire's classifications, may be found in Table 4 on page 57.

Discussion of Squire's Classifications

Division of the reactions according to Squire's classifications resulted in a wide range in the numerical count in each group as can be seen in Table 1, on page 53. Although the mean for the seven groups was 928, the actual numbers in each varied from 139 to

Table 1

Individual and Group Numerical Scores of Responses in Squire's Classifications

Subject	Classifications I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	Total
No. 1	13	29	82	--	18	2	--	144
No. 2	32	131	19	4	34	22	7	249
No. 3	8	66	78	14	24	2	--	192
No. 4	17	26	21	2	25	--	2	93
No. 5	9	67	91	11	54	--	7	239
No. 6	25	62	60	13	22	5	15	202
No. 7	10	27	46	1	10	5	6	105
No. 8	6	51	70	--	3	6	6	142
No. 9	12	45	67	3	33	11	3	174
No. 10	7	63	149	--	30	6	1	265
No. 11	80	115	54	17	84	9	4	363
No. 12	14	27	38	--	32	--	--	111
No. 13	13	38	26	--	16	5	--	98
No. 14	3	50	26	--	21	--	3	103
No. 15	12	56	24	8	22	1	6	129
No. 16	14	62	40	--	5	16	--	137
No. 17	8	77	126	--	14	5	9	239
No. 18	4	127	58	2	3	14	7	215
No. 19	9	83	13	1	22	6	--	134
No. 20	10	32	48	5	14	--	--	109
No. 21	9	148	180	20	34	--	23	414
No. 22	17	72	7	15	29	6	4	150
No. 23	37	185	59	35	62	6	6	390
No. 24	13	64	106	6	25	1	1	216
No. 25	--	31	63	--	--	5	1	100
No. 26	14	33	44	8	7	2	1	109
No. 27	1	22	27	--	14	--	--	64
No. 28	2	74	120	5	13	3	--	217
No. 29	7	10	25	--	13	--	--	55
No. 30	23	41	94	1	17	--	--	176
No. 31	5	12	46	1	23	1	--	88
No. 32	6	13	30	--	11	3	--	63
No. 33	15	18	37	13	16	6	2	107
No. 34	11	28	7	4	19	--	5	74
No. 35	24	111	31	4	10	2	3	185
No. 36	7	68	63	4	27	8	3	180
No. 37	8	78	120	--	6	8	5	225
No. 38	20	15	30	5	32	4	--	106
No. 39	4	28	84	--	9	--	9	135
	505	2268	2339	202	874	170	139	6497

I Literary Judgments
II Interpretational Responses
III Narrational Reactions
IV Associational
V Self-involvement
VI Prescriptive Judgments
VII Miscellaneous

2,339. As might be expected, the lowest total was found to be in the Miscellaneous classification. But the high number of Narrational reactions was almost equalled by those placed in the second classification—Interpretational. Only 71 reactions separated these two groups.

Self-involvement reactions and Literary judgments followed, in that order, but neither of them reached the mean of 928. Self-involvement reactions were slightly less, but the totals for all the remaining classifications were far below the average.

The totals for the three stories, of individual subjects, also showed considerable variety. They ranged from 55 made by Subject 29, to 414 from Subject 21. The average number for the subjects was 167; but the totals of seventeen were well above, and those of twenty-two did not reach this average. There were twelve totals for the three stories of over 200 reactions, while seven subjects made less than 100.

The range of numbers of reactions within each classification varied considerably also. Subject 25 made no Literary judgments, while 80 were made by Subject 11. The range of Interpretational responses was from 10, made by Subject 29, to 185 made by Subject 23.

Responses placed in the group of Narrational reactions varied from 7, made by both Subjects 22 and 34, to 180 made by Subject 21. Fourteen subjects made no Associational reactions at all, while the highest number in this group was the 35 made by Subject 23.

There were responses from every subject placed in Categories 2 and 3, while only Subject 25 had none in Category 5. This would seem to suggest that for these subjects involvement in the story was

an aspect of response to literature as important as narration and interpretation of the facts. At the other extreme 23, the count of Subject 21, was the highest individual score in the Miscellaneous category, and fourteen contributed nothing towards the total of 139. In the same way, Category 6 received comparatively few of the total responses. Only 170 were placed in this group, with eleven subjects having none, and 22, made by Subject 2, the highest score.

Table 2

Numerical Means of Responses in Squire's Classifications

I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
13	58	60	5	22	4	3.5

The numerical means of Interpretational responses and Narrational reactions were 58 and 60 respectively. In the third and fourth places, but with means much lower, were Self-involvement with 22, and Literary judgments with 13. Then followed Associational, Prescriptive judgments and Miscellaneous in that order, with only 1.5 difference between the highest of 5 and the lowest of 3.5.

Table 3, on page 56, presents the ranges and median percentages of responses in the same classifications, since they show relationships more clearly than does the numerical count. It may be noticed that the rank order of the median percentages of responses in Categories 2 and 3 is the reverse of that of the numerical means. The median of Category 2 is 38, since the range is from the 14% of

Subjects 31 and 38, to the 62% of Subject 19. The range for Category 3 was from 5% to 63%, the scores of Subjects 22 and 25, which gave it the median percentage of 34.

Table 3

Ranges and Median Percentages of Responses in Squire's Classifications

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
Low	1	14	5	1	2	1	1
High	19	62	63	12	20	12	7
Median	10	38	34	6.5	16	6.5	4

Third in rank is the median of 16 in Category 5. It is, however, less than half of either of those in the first two places. This result would suggest that the vast majority of responses were either reproductions of the facts of the stories, or attempts to interpret the significance of those facts. A glance at Table 4 on page 57, shows that this is so. In only a few cases do the percentages in any other classification exceed those in Narrational or Interpretational reactions.

The response pattern of Subject 38 is unique. The percentage of responses which was classed as Self-involvement exceeds those of every other group. Subjects 12, 29 and 31 have higher percentages of Self-involvement reactions than of Interpretational. Subjects 2, 4, 19, 22 and 34 have higher percentages of Self-involvement reactions than of Narrational. Subjects 2, 22 and 34 have higher percentages

Table 4

Individual Percentages of Responses in Squire's Classifications

Subject	Classifications							Subject	Classifications						
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
No. 1	10	20	57	--	12	1	--	No. 21	2	36	43	5	8	--	6
No. 2	13	52	7	2	14	9	3	No. 22	11	48	5	10	19	4	3
No. 3	4	34	41	7	13	1	--	No. 23	9	47	15	9	6	2	2
No. 4	18	28	23	2	27	--	2	No. 24	6	30	49	3	12	--	--
No. 5	4	28	38	5	22	--	3	No. 25	--	31	63	--	--	5	1
No. 6	12	31	30	6	11	3	7	No. 26	13	30	40	7	7	2	1
No. 7	9	26	44	[illegible]	9	5	6	No. 27	2	34	42	--	22	--	--
No. 8	4	36	50	--	2	4	4	No. 28	1	34	55	2	6	2	--
No. 9	7	26	38	2	19	6	2	No. 29	13	18	45	--	24	--	--
No. 10	3	24	56	--	15	2	--	No. 30	13	23	53	1	10	--	--
No. 11	15	32	23	5	22	2	1	No. 31	6	14	52	1	26	1	--
No. 12	3	24	34	--	29	--	--	No. 32	9	21	48	--	17	5	--
No. 13	13	39	27	--	16	5	--	No. 33	14	17	35	12	15	5	2
No. 14	3	49	25	--	20	--	3	No. 34	15	38	9	5	26	--	7
No. 15	9	43	19	6	17	1	5	No. 35	13	60	17	2	5	1	2
No. 16	10	45	29	--	4	12	--	No. 36	4	38	35	2	15	4	2
No. 17	3	32	53	--	6	2	4	No. 37	4	35	53	--	3	3	2
No. 18	2	59	27	1	1	7	3	No. 38	19	14	28	5	30	4	--
No. 19	7	62	10	1	16	4	--	No. 39	3	21	62	--	8	--	6
No. 20	9	29	44	5	13	--	--								

I Literary Judgments
II Interpretational Responses
III Narrational Reactions
IV Associational
V Self-involvement
VI Prescriptive Judgments
VII Miscellaneous

of Literary comments than of Narrational. But other than for Subject 38, the highest percentage of responses was either Interpretational or Narrational. For the majority of the subjects the percentages of the reactions in these two classifications were the two highest.

It might be noticed that in only thirteen cases did the percentages of the total response have to be found for all seven classifications. On the other hand Subjects 12, 25, 27 and 29 made only four kinds of reactions.

Information regarding the kinds of reactions, however, whether it be in relation to numbers, percentages, or patterns of response, gives no indication of the success or failure of the subjects. It gives no suggestion even, that errors such as those quoted previously, had been made. Nevertheless, examination of the verbalized reactions for the purpose of finding the patterns of response did show the direction this study should take. It gave to it a more immediate purpose—examination for evidence of successful comprehension of the literary material. Further analysis of the data was carried out with that purpose in mind, and a detailed description is reported in chapter four.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA—COMPREHENSION OF LITERARY SELECTIONS

The previous chapter indicated that the prime purpose of the present study would be exploration of the accuracy of comprehension. This chapter discusses the processes involved in dividing the data into responses, and describes the kinds placed in each category and subcategory.

There are three divisions. The first compares the numerical scores and percentages of responses to each story, and shows how the main categories were established. The responses placed in each category are then compared. The second division is comprised of a description and a comparison of the subcategories found in each of the three main groups. The final division is a summary of the chapter.

ESTABLISHING THE CATEGORIES

Prior to examining the verbalized reactions to establish categories related to comprehension, a definition of "response" was required which would make possible such an examination.

Redefined Response

For the remainder of this report, a response might be understood to be the complete expression of an idea. Its form might be a short phrase, or even a single word. At other times, a sentence, or a group of sentences was needed before the idea was completely expressed. Occasionally the same idea was recurring. It could be stated, and either restated or developed further within the same

content unit. Or it could continue from section to section as a focus of attention until it was either accepted or refuted. It was necessary, therefore, to write each idea separately on a file card, or group of file cards. This enabled earlier statements to be retrieved and fastened to the final remark made in connection with them.

Similarly, the idea itself, or content of a response varied considerably. Sometimes it was the narration of a single, observed detail, noticed but referred to no more. It might, however, consist also of comments on the significance of that detail; in which case it would include speculation, inference, interpretation, opinion, prediction, or a reaction—either attitudinal or emotional. Examples of idea units may be found in Appendix B.

Comparison of Responses to Each Story

A summary of the ranges and means of responses to each story may be seen in Table 5 below.

Table 5

Ranges and Numerical Means of Responses to Each of the Stories

	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3
Low	12	4	9
High	49	44	54
Mean	26.5	20	28

The lowest score was that of Subject 31, who made only 4 responses to Story 2. The highest made to any of the stories was the 54 of Subject 21 evoked by Story 3.

The range for Story 1 was from 12 to 49; for Story 2, it was from 4 to 44; and for Story 3, from 9 to 54. The numerical means were 26.5, 20, and 28 for the stories respectively, which suggest that the subjects had apparently found the most to talk about in response to Story 3, and the least in response to Story 2.

The total numerical count of idea units was 2893, as may be seen in Table 6 on page 62. The difference between the numbers evoked by Stories 1 and 3 is not very great. They received 1032 and 1081 respectively—a difference of only 49. Story 2, however, evoked far less than either of the other two. The final count for that story was 780, more than 200 less than either of the others.

The totals of individual subjects covered a wide range, with 38 the lowest and 129 the highest. There were seven totals of less than 50, and four of over 100. The highest in each case, however, was not evoked by the same story, and the responses of a number of subjects do not follow the pattern suggested in Table 5. For example, Subject 4 made 24 reactions to Story 1, only 7 to Story 2, while the number evoked by Story 3 was the approximate average of the other two. Similar differences with regards to Stories 1 or 3 may be seen in the scores of Subjects 1, 8, 31 and 35; but Story 2 evoked the least in each case.

Variations in the group pattern may also be noticed in the reactions of Subjects 2 and 5. While Stories 2 and 3 evoked an almost equal number, Story 1 evoked nearly twice as many. A similar situation is apparent with regards to Story 3 in the responses of Subjects 12, 21, 28 and 30. The reactions of Subjects 19 and 39, it may be

Table 6

Individual and Group Numerical Scores of Responses to each of the Stories

Subject	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3	Total
No. 1	22	17	36	75
No. 2	40	28	28	96
No. 3	28	20	23	71
No. 4	24	7	15	46
No. 5	41	23	28	92
No. 6	34	20	26	80
No. 7	26	15	15	56
No. 8	24	18	35	77
No. 9	37	30	24	91
No. 10	49	40	27	116
No. 11	30	25	36	91
No. 12	12	12	36	60
No. 13	21	14	18	53
No. 14	22	13	29	64
No. 15	13	25	30	68
No. 16	31	19	31	81
No. 17	37	24	22	83
No. 18	35	27	29	91
No. 19	26	25	29	80
No. 20	20	17	22	59
No. 21	23	27	54	104
No. 22	33	20	33	86
No. 23	39	44	46	129
No. 24	36	40	34	110
No. 25	26	7	22	55
No. 26	21	12	29	62
No. 27	16	17	9	42
No. 28	26	20	44	90
No. 29	14	8	17	39
No. 30	27	28	42	97
No. 31	13	4	27	44
No. 32	12	16	10	38
No. 33	16	10	22	48
No. 34	17	10	18	45
No. 35	35	15	24	74
No. 36	32	23	37	92
No. 37	28	18	28	74
No. 38	19	15	20	54
No. 39	27	27	26	80
Total	1032	780	1081	2893

seen, were fairly consistent to each of the stories, while Subjects 24, 27 and 32 made their highest score in response to Story 2.

The inconsistencies remarked upon above show the individual nature of response to literature. There might have been other causes of the diversity evident in Table 6 on page 62, however, which could be revealed by examination of the content of the responses. Such an examination was, therefore, undertaken with regards to accuracy of comprehension of the selections.

Separation into Major Categories

A sample of approximately thirty idea units was selected at random for examination regarding some kind of response pattern related to comprehension. Three patterns were recognized easily. Some responses provided clear evidence of successful comprehension of what had been read—evidence that could be verified with reference to the texts of the stories. These were termed Acceptable responses.

The second pattern found was somewhat confusing. On the one hand there was no verifiable evidence of comprehension, but on the other hand responses in this pattern did not provide evidence of error. Accurate comprehension could not reasonably be ascertained. These responses, therefore, were considered to be Miscellaneous.

The third pattern did provide evidence of inaccurate comprehension. The responses were wrong, and so were labelled Deviant.

Acceptable responses. Responses placed in this group contained evidence of accurate comprehension of the experiences presented in the stories—evidence that could be verified from the texts of the

stories. Reconstruction of details, or the correct report of conversation provided such evidence. So, too, did the narration of incidents in the familiar language of the subjects, or the summary of ideas contained in a section of the story. Responses in which ideas had been interpreted in the context of the story were also included. In addition those which expressed a reaction considered to be appropriate on evidence provided, were placed in this category on the basis of that evidence.

Miscellaneous responses. Insufficient evidence of accurate comprehension was often the result of the subjects failing to communicate adequately the ideas they were attempting to express. Vague, generalized, unsubstantiated comments, or ambiguous ones were included in this category, as well as expressions of taste, or other reactions for which no identifiable evidence could be found. Responses referring to previous personal experiences, or others, which had no apparent relevance to those in the stories, were also counted as Miscellaneous.

Deviant responses. As the term "deviance" is used in this study, it might be understood as the unsuccessful attempt to bridge the gap that existed between the ideas on the printed page, and the inability of the reader to grasp them satisfactorily. Deviant responses were the result of these unsuccessful attempts. They provided evidence of misreading, misunderstanding, or misinterpreting the facts of the stories. Responses which indicated failure to grasp the literal facts, and those which contained invalid interpretation

of the significance of those facts, were placed here. In addition, those which failed to recognize time or causal relationships, as well as those which contained unjust critical comments concerning the characters, the story, or the author were included.

As soon as the three main categories were established, the responses were compared with the texts of the stories, and were marked Acceptable, Miscellaneous, or Deviant. Those in each category were counted, and the results tabulated Because of the unstructured, and numerically diverse nature of the responses, the results were tabled as percentages of each subject's total. The percentages in each category were then examined and compared.

COMPARISON OF RESPONSES IN EACH CATEGORY

Percentages of each subject's total responses placed in each of the major categories are presented in Table 8 on page 67. The ranges and medians are summarized in the short table below.

Table 7

Ranges and Median Percentages of Responses in Major Categories

	Acc.	Misc.	Dev.
Low	28	2	16
High	78	53	53
Median	53	27.5	34.5

It may be seen in Table 7 that the highest median percentage of any of the groups was the 53 for Acceptable responses. The lowest

percentage in that category was 28, while the highest was 78. With regards to both the Miscellaneous and the Deviant responses, the highest percentage was 53, but for the latter the lowest was 16 and for the former it was 2. The median, therefore, of Deviant responses was 34.5% and that of Miscellaneous, was 27.5%.

Table 8 on page 67 shows that thirty-four subjects, twenty of whom had a score above the median, had their highest percentage of responses placed in the Acceptable category. Subjects 2, 6, 11 and 21 had their highest placed in the Deviant category, and of these four, one had made over 100 responses. However, there were eight subjects with a percentage of 33 or more in the Deviant category. That means that one third of their responses were wrong.

It is noticeable that Subject 34 had no Deviant responses. But the highest percentage in this case was in the Miscellaneous, not in the Acceptable group.

Ten other subjects had a higher percentage of Miscellaneous that Deviant responses, but their highest was in the Acceptable category. Even so, because of the nature of the responses placed in the Miscellaneous group, a median of 27.5 is rather high. It would seem to suggest insecurity, or a lack of precision in the use of the English language.

In addition the high median of 34.5 for Deviant responses, and the median of 53 for Acceptable, which eighteen subjects did not reach, would suggest that the stories might have been too difficult for approximately half of the subjects. In order to find out more specifically, percentages of individual responses to each story were

Table 8

Individual Percentages of Responses
in Major Categories

Subject	Acc.	Misc.	Dev.	Subject	Acc.	Misc.	Dev.	Subject	Acc.	Misc.	Dev.
No. 1	68	9	23	No. 14	55	15	30	No. 27	67	16.5	16.5
No. 2	28	19	53	No. 15	72	13	15	No. 28	74	9	17
No. 3	69	14	17	No. 16	69	14	17	No. 29	56	21	23
No. 4	46	28	26	No. 17	47	16	37	No. 30	47	20	33
No. 5	52	21	27	No. 18	63	4	33	No. 31	52	30	18
No. 6	32	24	44	No. 19	64	15	21	No. 32	39	32	29
No. 7	50	34	16	No. 20	64	12	24	No. 33	62	21	17
No. 8	64	14	22	No. 21	40	9	51	No. 34	47	53	--
No. 9	55	24	21	No. 22	49	26	25	No. 35	68	8	24
No. 10	52	14	34	No. 23	53	18	29	No. 36	66	9	25
No. 11	38	21	41	No. 24	64	9	27	No. 37	74	2	24
No. 12	40	32	28	No. 25	78	6	16	No. 38	43	35	22
No. 13	70	13	17	No. 26	50	24	26	No. 39	51	25	24

tabulated in relation to the three main categories.

Acceptable Responses to Each Story

The percentages of Acceptable responses evoked by each of the three stories may be seen in Table 10 on page 69. The ranges, once again, are quite broad, and have been summarized in a short table below.

Table 9

Ranges and Median Percentages of Acceptable Responses to Each Story

	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3
Low	16	4	16
High	56	42	83
Median	36	23	49.5

The 4% of Subject 38 to Story 2 was the lowest score of Acceptable responses; the 83% of Subject 12 to Story 3 was the highest. The range for Story 1 was from 16 to 56; for Story 2, from 4 to 42; and for Story 3, from 16 to 83. Thus the median percentages were 36, 23 and 49.5 respectively. It might be noticed that the highest percentage of Acceptable responses made to Story 2 was not as high as the median percentage made to Story 3.

The results tabulated on page 69 show that nine subjects made their highest percentage of Acceptable responses to Story 1, while twenty-six did to Story 3. Only Subject 5 had a higher percentage for Story 2 than for either of the others. The lowest scores of twenty-seven subjects, however, were found to be in response to Story

Table 10

Individual Percentages of Acceptable Responses to Each Story

Subject	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3	Subject	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3	Subject	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3
No. 1	27	26	47	No. 14	29	17	54	No. 27	36	36	28
No. 2	22	33	45	No. 15	16	35	49	No. 28	27	18	55
No. 3	37	26	37	No. 16	36	27	37	No. 29	32	18	50
No. 4	48	19	33	No. 17	46	15	39	No. 30	19	24	56
No. 5	31	36	33	No. 18	42	28	30	No. 31	22	4	74
No. 6	42	42	16	No. 19	33	24	43	No. 32	33	20	47
No. 7	36	32	32	No. 20	29	24	47	No. 33	20	23	57
No. 8	29	22	49	No. 21	26	24	50	No. 34	33	24	43
No. 9	56	22	22	No. 22	32	22	46	No. 35	50	22	28
No. 10	39	31	30	No. 23	31	26	43	No. 36	36	23	41
No. 11	37	20	43	No. 24	17	40	43	No. 37	40	18	42
No. 12	17	--	83	No. 25	49	7	44	No. 38	52	4	44
No. 13	35	27	38	No. 26	39	13	48	No. 39	42	12	46

2. The lowest of six were in response to Story 1, and of only three to Story 3.

While factors in the stories themselves could account for the diversity seen in Table 10, the idiosyncracies of the subjects cannot be ignored. For instance, while none of the responses of Subject 12 to Story 2 was labelled Acceptable, the highest percentage in that category to any of the stories was made by this subject to Story 3. The pattern of Subject 31 is similar, but the range is not so great. Only 4% of the Acceptables responses were evoked by Story 2, yet Story 3 elicited 74% of the same subject's total. The pattern of Subject 6 is also rather unique. The highest score of 42% to Story 2 was made by this subject, and a similar, though not the highest percentage, to Story 1. But the lowest percentage of 16 for Acceptable responses made to Story 3 was the score of Subject 6.

From these results, it would appear that for the majority of subjects accurate comprehension of Story 3 was more successful than of Stories 1 or 2. It is apparent, however, that what may be termed "readability" of stories must vary according to the reader. What one subject would seem to have found too difficult was the story to evoke the highest percentage of Acceptable responses from another, and vice versa. Variations in reading ability alone could not account for the inconsistencies apparent in Table 10.

Miscellaneous Responses to Each Story

The highest score in this category was the 100% made by Subject 37 to Story 2; and that, of course, is the reason for the high median

for that story seen in Table 11 below.

Table 11

Ranges and Median Percentages of Miscellaneous Responses to Each Story

	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3
Low	8	5	9
High	82	100	75
Median	45	52.5	42

The range of the percentages of Miscellaneous responses to Story 1 was from 8 to 82; to Story 2, from 5 to 100; and to Story 3, from 9 to 75. The medians were 45%, 52.5%, and 42% respectively. The rank order, therefore, placed Story 2 first, Story 1 second, and Story 3 third. That, however, was not always the pattern of individual scores.

Table 12 on page 72 shows that twelve subjects made their highest percentage to Story 1, and eleven to each of Stories 2 and 3. Causes of ambiguous and inarticulate responses were thus to be found in each of the stories by a similar number of subjects.

The first noticeable difference between the results presented in Table 12 and the others discussed so far, is the absence of responses by at least one subject to one or other of the stories. No Miscellaneous responses were made by one subject to Story 1, and by one to Story 3. None was made by four to Story 2. It would appear that clarity in expressing ideas obtained through reading might bear some relationship to the accuracy with which they were originally

Table 12

Individual Percentages of Miscellaneous Responses to Each Story

Subject	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3	Subject	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3	Subject	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3
No. 1	29	--	71	No. 14	20	50	30	No. 27	29	57	14
No. 2	50	28	22	No. 15	11	67	22	No. 28	37.5	12.5	50
No. 3	20	40	40	No. 16	46	18	36	No. 29	25	50	25
No. 4	46	--	54	No. 17	8	46	46	No. 30	27	42	31
No. 5	32	26	42	No. 18	25	--	75	No. 31	23	15	62
No. 6	58	5	37	No. 19	17	33	50	No. 32	33	42	25
No. 7	48	26	26	No. 20	43	43	14	No. 33	50	10	40
No. 8	82	9	9	No. 21	67	11	22	No. 34	42	21	37
No. 9	18	36	46	No. 22	43	9	48	No. 35	50	17	33
No. 10	56	13	31	No. 23	29	46	25	No. 36	25	37.5	37.5
No. 11	31.5	37	31.5	No. 24	30	50	20	No. 37	--	100	--
No. 12	32	10	58	No. 25	67	--	33	No. 38	26	32	42
No. 13	43	28.5	28.5	No. 26	33.3	33.3	33.3	No. 39	40	45	15

obtained.

Reasons for ambiguous or inarticulate responses varied with each story. In the case of Story 1, the number of characters might have been confusing. It was probably the reason for avoiding names and referring to one, or a group of them, by using pronouns, which could apply equally to a number of the characters. Confusion was caused by the use of the personal pronoun in the title of Story 2. This was understood by many as referring to Alfred. As a result Alfred was continually referred to as "she," with Mrs. Higgins as "her mother"; or Mrs. Higgins as "he," and Alfred, "his son." Of itself, this speech habit was not confusing, but when it was not used consistently, and there was no way of knowing which "he" or "she" was being referred to, it was confusing to the investigator.

In the responses to all of the stories there was the tendency to quote difficult words or phrases as if they were in the functional oral vocabulary of the subjects, yet there was no real evidence of comprehension.

Deviant Responses to Each Story

The highest percentages of Deviant responses made to each story were 80, 73, and 59 respectively. These were the scores of Subjects 5, 32, and both 8 and 21, who made similar high scores in response to Story 3. The lowest percentages evoked by each story were 6, 4, and 3, the scores of Subjects 8, 5, and 17. These results, together with the median percentages, are presented in the short table on page 74.

Table 13

Ranges and Median Percentages of Deviant Responses to Each Story

	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3
Low	6	4	3
High	80	73	59
Median	43	38.5	31

While the differences between the lowest percentages of Deviant responses to each of the stories are not very great, those of the highest show a range of more than twenty. The medians are, thus, noticeably affected. The highest was 43% for Story 1, followed by 38.5% for Story 2, and 31% for Story 3. This would suggest that the greatest problems were met by the subjects in trying to grasp the ideas in Story 1, and the least in Story 3.

Individual percentages of Deviant responses may be seen in Table 14 on page 75. Seventeen subjects made their highest in response to the first story, and five made their lowest. The highest percentages of Deviant responses of eleven subjects were made to Story 2, and the lowest of twelve. Eight others made their highest in response to Story 3, while fifteen made their lowest. Thus, while difficulties were encountered in each of the stories, the majority of subjects seem to have found Story 1 to be the most difficult, and Story 3, the least. However, the idiosyncracies of three of them—Subjects 8, 5, and 32—might be noticed.

Of the Deviant responses of Subject 8, the 59% made to Story 3 was the highest for that story, and the 6% made to Story 1, the

Table 14

Individual Percentages of Deviant Responses to Each Story

Subject	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3	Subject	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3	Subject	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3
No. 1	35	24	41	No. 14	52	10	39	No. 27	57	43	--
No. 2	49	27	24	No. 15	40	20	40	No. 28	33	47	20
No. 3	67	25	8	No. 16	43	14	43	No. 29	56	--	44
No. 4	67	25	8	No. 17	58	39	3	No. 30	41	28	31
No. 5	80	4	16	No. 18	33	37	30	No. 31	62	12	25
No. 6	34	23	43	No. 19	51	43	6	No. 32	27	73	--
No. 7	78	11	11	No. 20	43	36	21	No. 33	50	25	25
No. 8	6	35	59	No. 21	11	30	59	No. 34	--	--	--
No. 9	26	58	16	No. 22	45	41	14	No. 35	39	17	44
No. 10	41	49	10	No. 23	30	40	30	No. 36	35	26	39
No. 11	30	30	40	No. 24	70	23	7	No. 37	33	39	28
No. 12	12	59	29	No. 25	33	45	22	No. 38	17	66	17
No. 13	56	22	22	No. 26	25	19	56	No. 39	11	68	21

lowest made to that one. The highest percentage made to Story 1 was the 80% of Subject 5; yet the lowest percentage in this category made to Story 2 was the 4% of the same subject. Finally, Subject 32, whose 73 was the highest percentage made to Story 2, made no Deviant responses to Story 3. Extremes such as these would seem to have been caused by factors other than the difficulty of the reading material alone.

Nevertheless, difficulties in relation to Mansfield's story were many, but the most common were encountered with the literary devices and complex structure used. In addition, the parental control over the behaviour of the children in the story, was not even noticed by a considerable number of subjects.

With regards to Story 2, one of the main causes of error has already been indicated as the use of the personal pronoun in the title of the story. Others were the result of the attitudes and expectations of the subjects, some of which were erroneously set by the title. Expectations with respect to Story 3 were also responsible for some of the Deviant responses to that story. In addition, failure to recognize the historical setting of the story, or the flashback technique used by the author caused some of the errors.

The rank order of the stories according to the medians, placed Story 3 first in the Acceptable category, with Story 2, third. In the second category Story 2 ranked first, and Story 3, last. The only place that Story 1 was either first or last was in the Deviant category. Here the median percentage of responses to that story ranked first, and to Story 3, last. In the responses to all of the

stories, however, there was the diversity that has been revealed in Tables 7 to 14, with regards to both individual and group patterns. In order to achieve greater understanding of the reasons for the diversity, the responses in the three major categories were separated into subcategories for further analysis.

FURTHER ANALYSIS OF THE RESPONSES

Many attempts were made to establish the subcategories within the main groups. They needed to be discrete enough to limit the kinds placed in each group, but broad enough to include the variety of responses in each of the major categories. Initially, only the responses of the ten subjects who had had the most to say were examined. After repeated groupings, reexamination and regroupings, a tentative list of categories was drawn up, which included the patterns found most consistently. This list was then revised to include the responses of all the subjects.

OUTLINE OF CATEGORIES AND SUBCATEGORIES

Acceptable

1. Accurate reconstruction.
2. Recognizing experiences.
3. Understanding characters.
4. Recognizing relationships.
5. Appropriate reactions.

Miscellaneous

1. Exact quotations.

2. Ambiguous remarks.
3. Incomplete statements.
4. Irrelevant ideas.
5. Unsubstantiated generalizations.
6. Vague, inarticulate comments.

Deviant

1. Wrong character identification.
2. Wrong report of the action.
3. Misunderstanding characters.
4. Wrong associations.
5. Wrong relationships established.
6. Inappropriate reactions.

ESTABLISHING ACCEPTABLE CATEGORIES

Responses which were considered Acceptable contained identifiable evidence of accurate comprehension. Six categories were finally established, which could accommodate all such responses.

Accurate reconstruction. Responses which reproduced accurately the literal facts of the stories were placed in this category. Evidence of successful comprehension was provided by translation, paraphrase, and summary.

Recognizing experiences. Into this group were placed those responses which reproduced accurately the setting, the background, or the situation in which the characters were placed. Those also

were included which showed recognition of the psychological or emotional experience of a character from his description or behaviour, as well as from his reactions to other people's behaviour.

Understanding characters. Comments concerning the nature or predisposition of the characters, substantiated with evidence from the stories, were counted here. Association with people showing similar characteristics also provided evidence that the nature of the fictional character had been recognized.

Recognizing relationships. Accurate paraphrase included recognition of the time relationship between reported events. Correct causal relationships, such as the intentions or motivations of the characters, were also recognized. Responses of that kind comprised this group.

Appropriate reactions. While specific reactions to the characters or the plot are individual and personal, those were categorized as Acceptable which were considered to be appropriate in the context of the story, and in the light of the evidence provided.

Each of the above categories has been described more fully and exemplified below.

Accurate Reconstruction

As a minimum, reproduction by means of translation, paraphrase, or summary requires knowledge of the vocabulary and of the sentence structure used by the author. Exact, or almost exact phrases, followed by reproduction of the same idea in more familiar language was

a popular type of response. Accurate reconstruction might also require recognition of some specific stylistic technique. Examples of responses indicating the use of various skills and abilities have been provided.

Translation of key words or phrases. There were responses in which knowledge of the literal or denotative meanings of words was shown in the correct translation of key words or phrases. Translation was often worked into the response as in the following example.

> "... the storekeeper told Alfred's mum that he stole things, and he probably thought his mum would beg him not to do anything like jail her son. Well, she surprised him. She just took it."

"Plead tearfully" had been translated into "beg him," and "vast tolerance" translated into "She just took it." Following are other examples of that kind of translation.

Text	Subject
"The girls . . . nearly fought to put their arms round her"	"All the girls flocked around her"
"she sounded swell"	"He thought she was grand"
"a well-planned departure"	"it was time to leave"

Translation of idiom and of figurative language. Some responses had demanded more of the reader than the ability to translate words and phrases, for example, the translation of idiom and of figurative language.

Text	Subject
"The Burnell children burned to tell everybody."	"were excited to tell everybody."
	"could hardly wait to tell"

"were anxious to tell"

"let it go at that." "drop the whole thing"

"didn't tell the cops."

"like fishes in a lake." "Well, a lake has no opening, and the fishes can't get out. He acts as if he can't leave that 300 square mile plot. . ."

Responses showing observation and reconstruction of the literal facts of the stories, which required knowledge such as is demonstrated above, were not counted separately. All of those which provided evidence of accurate reconstruction were placed in this subcategory on the basis of accuracy only.

Paraphrase. Reconstruction by means of paraphrase, was, as might have been expected, the most-used means of presenting the facts. Each of the three examples below is concerned with a different kind of literal fact.

(1) Description of a single object. Almost every subject gave a description of the doll's house with more or less detail.

> "It's talking about a doll house. They'd painted the doll house. Inside there was furniture in it. And a chimney, coloured, on top of the roof."

(2) Narration of a single detail. The example chosen shows the ability to report what had been written in the form of direct speech.

> "He phones the mother and tells him that her son stole something out of the drugstore."

(3) Narration of a collection of details.

> "This part of the story tells me that an Indian was travelling on foot, and he was trying to make it to the Mexican border. He didn't have

> any food for three days and was hungry. And he came to a house on the edge of the foothills near the Mexican border."

It may have been noticed that each of the examples above is in response to a different story. Wherever possible examples have been selected from the transcriptions of responses to each story.

Summary. Paraphrase was not always detailed, and so various kinds of summary were also included in this subdivision.

(1) General summary. So long as evidence of comprehension of the details referred to was not hidden by over-generalization, general summaries were included here.

> "It tells about how big the doll house was, and how brightly coloured it was, and how it was made, and things like that."

(2) Fusion. A number of ideas was sometimes fused into a single statement.

> "It told like, as if she was frightened, or an old lady, like—trembling with a cup of tea."

(3) Summary of pertinent information. Information with regards to a character or event was gathered into a single report.

> "He was an Indian. He was running away from his people at home, and he came to this place. He had been trying to get out of the reservation for a long time, and he finally did."

Point of view. Responses which successfully recognized the point of view from which a comment was made were also placed in this subcategory. Mansfield frequently wrote from the point of view of the characters.

"I think Kezia studies everything because she compares the big children in the doll house to the lantern."

Accurate reconstruction of a narrative may require the reader to distinguish between fact and opinion, as in the following example.

"The Indians always used to say that the whites always got them sick. They said that—God help them—all kinds of sickness."

Sometimes difficulty was encountered in making clear that a statement made was the opinion of a character, not of the respondent.

"Well, I guess he didn't take the horse because the deputies would think that—they'd have a pretty good idea that—well, he thought they'd have a good idea—if he was caught with a white man's horse—like stealing it?"

Sensory reconstruction. Responses which included sensory details in the reconstruction were included in this division.

"I like the colours, but not the smell."

"I could feel the cold night air as they were walking home. And I could hear the train's shrill whistle."

Correction of previous errors. When the required skills were not in the possession of the subjects, errors in reconstruction were made inevitably. Among the responses placed in this group were those which contained corrections of previously misunderstood literal facts.

"I made a mistake when I said Alfred was making himself a cup of tea. It was Mrs. Higgins."

Two subjects had made the mistake of having Alfred make tea for himself, but only one corrected the error.

"Before, I said Alfred was fair. Well, he

> wasn't I found out now. Well, Alfred said, 'Yes' when her mother asked if she was doing all this—if she was stealing all these valuables."

From the examples given of the responses placed in the first subcategory of Accurate reconstruction, it can be seen that identifiable evidence of comprehension—of understanding, and reconstructing the details and incidents in the stories—was provided by the subjects in a variety of ways. The variety was not quite so great, of the kinds of responses placed in the second subcategory.

Recognizing Experiences

Recognition of an experience requires more than a literal understanding of the facts of the story. It requires recognition of the significance of those facts. Successful recognition also depends on the ability to realize the feelings or the reactions of the participants in the action. Such sensitivity must begin, however, with recognition of the action itself.

Recognizing the action. In each of the following responses, recognition may be seen to have been partly the result of personal experiences.

(1) Recognition of a familiar experience.

> "I like the part where the girls surround her because that's common. It makes me think about when girls have something special. Well most girls come around and try to be friends—special friends and all that."

(2) Recognition of implied action through recognition of descriptive details.

> "The part where Mrs. Higgins came in, well,

she didn't look like she dressed right. Like she looked like she just pulled her clothes on, and just came when the telephone rang. And her hair was just tucked in."

(3) Recognition through an associated personal experience.

"This part tells how the Indian was thinking back about the life on the reserve. Some of the Indians disliked it on the reserve. It makes me think of the stories my grandmother used to tell, and how the Indians—the Cree Indians—didn't like it on the reserve. I guess it's in my great grandmother's time—the story."

Recognizing a character's feelings and emotions, thoughts and ideas. In addition to linguistic knowledge and reading ability, a certain degree of sensitivity and of life experience is required when making this kind of response.

(1) Sensitive awareness of emotional reaction of a character.

"I think Kezia's going to be sorry, and she's going to cry, because she was just going to show Lil and Else her special lantern and her aunt came in just before she could show the lantern. I think she'd feel like crying. She wanted to have someone to show it to."

(2) Inference based on life experience and/or role expectancy.

"Well, when Mrs. Higgins came in she didn't look as if she was worried, but she must have been inside her heart."

(3) Generalization based on accurate observation of behaviour.

"I think the main part in the story is mostly about the Indian, how he changed his mind about the white man. The only way he had come in contact with white men was in being bitter. But this was the first time any of them had shown any friendliness towards him."

Understanding Characters

A number of the responses showed concern with trying to determine the kind of person a character was—or his personality predisposition.

Recognizing a character's predisposition. Success in recognizing the nature of the characters was achieved in different ways.

(1) Through the character's own words.

> "And also about the smell of the doll house—well, if I were Aunt Beryl I wouldn't talk. Well, she said the smell of the doll house would make anybody seriously ill—just the smell of it. At least she should have appreciated what Mrs. Hay did for the children—what she gave them. You can tell from her remark that she was, well, sort of a snarly-arly sort of a person."

(2) Through information supplied by the author.

> "In my opinion Alfred will be getting into all sorts of trouble, like lying, stealing, because it says that ever since he had gotten out of school, when he had a job, he had gotten into trouble."

(3) Through observation of the character's behaviour.

> "The man did some work for the woman, like chopping wood, and milking the cows, feeding the chickens, and washing the dishes he'd used. Then he said he was going to leave after he fixed lunch for the woman and the baby. I think he's a very nice man. He's kind."

Recognizing significance of character's behaviour. These responses indicated recognition of what had been implied, but not stated explicitly, by the author.

(1) "The Kelveys needed friends. They always tried to be near the other girls while they were talking."

(2) "Well it turned out that this woman, Alfred's mother, she'd had a hard time all her life. That's how it sounded towards the end of the story. And every time any of her children got into trouble she was all shaking and trembling, but she didn't show it."

(3) "I like them three poems on the wall. One thing is, when Willis was reading them, it made a great—a lot of difference to Willis, and he had different ideas what to do instead of doing bad things."

Reorganizing experiences. It was very encouraging to find the number of subjects prepared to change their first impressions of a character, in the light of further evidence. This was so particularly with regards to the two Kelvey girls, Mrs. Higgins, and the cowboy's wife.

(1) "After reading the third section, I feel sorry for those Kelvey girls. . . . After saying they were "high," I was surprised to read that they were poor."

(2) "At first, I thought Alfred's mum wasn't a good mother. I thought Alfred wasn't in on the charge. But Alfred's mum is beginning to come clearer, you know. She has patience and understanding now."

(3) "I thought the deputy would get the wrong idea about the Indian and his wife. I thought the lady was waiting for the deputy. But I guess she gave him the right story. She was pretty nice after all."

Recognizing Relationships

Accurate observation of the literal facts of the stories often resulted in recognition of causes or consequences of behaviour, based on these facts. Responses showing recognition of the intention, purpose, motivation, reason for, or result of, behaviour were put in

this subcategory.

Intention. Responses showing recognition of the characters' intentions were included here.

> "That other girl wanted to hurt the little Kelvey. And she said, 'Is it true your father's in prison?' she said. These little girls were trying to hurt these little Kelveys—I mean, hurt their feelings—by reminding them that their father was in prison."

> "I think Mrs. Higgins was kind to Sam Carr to get him to let Alfred go home with her."

> "It seems that he wants to catch him the next day. Well—maybe he wants to give him a chance. Maybe he's giving him a chance to reach the border, because he saved his wife and child. I think maybe he's giving him a chance to escape."

Motivation. Recognition of motivation, and even speculation with regards to why the characters behaved as they did, was the concern in the responses of this type. When speculation was successful, or apparently so, the responses were placed here.

> "All the girls were trying to make friends with Isabel . . . 'cause they wanted to see the doll house."

> "I think—the reason Alfred is stealing, is to sell the things he stole—I think he doesn't have enough money because he hangs around with the guys, and spends his money. He's stealing those things for spending money—for movies, and dates, and to buy clothes etc."

> "It's almost the same as it is here, Indians always getting drunk. That's why he ran away I think. Not really, but part of it. He didn't like the way the Indians were living on the reserve. He didn't like the

> way they were living—their ways. It was not the same as it was long ago. He liked it better long ago. They had freedom, and they weren't drunk until the whites gave them their liquor; that's what made them get drunk. I don't like it, but I can't express my feelings sometimes. It was—like I said—it was almost the same as it is on our reserve. They like to be somebody—not living by family allowance or payments. But they like to work and earn their own living."

In the above response, the experience of the character has been almost completely recognized. His actions, the cause or reason for his behaviour, his attitudes and his feelings, have all been remarked on. Recognition was not achieved solely through knowledge of words and their meanings. It was partly the result of personal associations aroused in the subject.

Cause and effect. These responses indicated that the subject had understood the real cause of the character's behaviour.

> "Aunt Beryl had had a letter from Willie Brent telling that if she did not meet him that evening in Pullman's Bush he'd come to the front door and ask the reason why. And after she'd read it she scolded Kezia—an' it was because of Willie's letter."

Result. A few responses showed recognition that a specific outcome was the result of some deliberate act.

> "I don't think anyone can change the Kelveys from what they were because they seem to be already set in their own ways, because of the way people ignored them, and the way the people treated them."

> "The woman puzzled Mr. Carr. He thought that the woman would cry and beg him to free his son. I thought the same way. But what the

> woman did—well, she didn't cry or anything like that. She just talked to the man, and finally convinced him that his son was, maybe too young, or too dumb to know what he was doing."

The final subdivision within the category of Acceptable responses was the one into which appropriate reactions were placed.

Appropriate Reactions

The predominant kind of verbalized reaction to incidents, or to details of the plot, was attitudinal. "Liking" or "disliking" the characters, approving or disapproving of their behaviour, was part of the reaction of a number of subjects to each story.

Attitudinal reactions. The criterion of acceptability was comprehension of the literal facts of the stories, and of their implications. It will be seen that the following reactions are accompanied by identifiable evidence of comprehension which justifies the attitudes adopted.

> "In a way, I didn't like the other children in the story—Isabel bragging about her doll house, especially in front of these little girls. They couldn't get anything like that."

> "His mother wouldn't let him talk to her. I liked that part. Alfred deserved it, 'cause it wasn't the first time he did those kind of things."

> "I like the sheriff. He was good to Willis. He gave him a day's start; and he took him outside so his wife wouldn't know."

Critical reactions. The majority of the reactions to the characters or to the stories was attitudinal, or emotional. There

were some critical or intellectual reactions, however, so a few examples have been included of that kind of response.

> "Mrs. Burnell said her daughters weren't to talk to the Kelvey girls. That was unfriendly and unthoughtful."

> "It makes me feel happy for Alfred because Mr. Carr was going to forget all about this little incident. But in my opinion Mr. Carr should have informed the police, because Alfred might get the idea that when he got another job, and he was in trouble again, the man he was working for would be like Mr. Carr."

> "And when the woman insisted that the Indian took the horse, the Indian refused. I don't think the Indian's smart because he's walking, and he doesn't have any horse, and he's a fugitive. I'd take the horse and ride to Mexico, where he said he was going."

Imaginary participation. The degree of imaginative involvement of the subjects was almost unbelievable. Nevertheless, it was not the reactions of themselves that made such responses Acceptable, but the evidence they provided of accurate observation of the action, and sensitivity towards the feelings of the characters.

> "I could feel myself there with them girls when Isabel was talking about the doll house."

> "I wish I could go see the doll house, because Isabel said so many things about it that were nice."

> "I wish I was—well, if I were in the story, I would want to help out those little Kelveys."

> "When Mr. Carr said he was sorry, he must have meant it, 'cause I could really feel it."

> "I think if I were him I would have just stayed on the reserve. But I guess he got tired of it. And I wouldn't like to be him because

> I'd be tired of running—I could almost feel myself running."
>
> "Well, I feel I should have took part. I should have seen this man, an' I would tell him what's wrong and what's right, and what he should do in that part of the country and on the reserve."

Emotional reactions. Although the subjects were probably not aware of the writer's technique, they often recognized the tone of a passage, and responded to it accordingly.

> "And they were all excited about the doll house, and it made me feel excited, too."
>
> "I feel excited, and want to keep on going. It didn't finish about when that man got home."

This last was the total content unit of Subject 4 to Section five of Story 3. Involvement was high for most of the subjects, and the greatest number of emotional reactions to that story was made at this point.

Empathic reactions. There were examples both of "feeling-for" characters, and of "feeling-with" characters among the responses. They were placed in this category, however, only if the details or incidents could be identified in the story.

> "I feel sorry for Isabel when she was just going to tell the girls, and the bell rang before she even got to school."

Feeling sympathy towards a character was the emotion most often verbalized, but others included:

> "I felt proud of the Indian . . . and I feel glad for the woman, too, . . ."

"I'm happy for Willis."

"I feel proud of that little Burnell girl, there . . ."

Many speech errors may be apparent in the examples above of Acceptable responses. Nevertheless, since they were not errors related to understanding the narrative, they did not prevent the responses from being placed in this group; such errors were disregarded. A limited functional knowledge of the language used is evident, it is true; but communication was not prevented.

COMPARISON OF ACCEPTABLE CATEGORIES

There were 1608 Acceptable responses according to Table 15 on page 94. The numerical mean, therefore, was 41. Individual totals ranged from 15 to 70. Five subjects, however, had totals of more than 60, while Subject 32 was the only one with a score of less than 20.

Accurate Reconstruction was the most popular kind of Acceptable response. Category 1 had a total of 730, two and a half times that of the second highest. The greatest difference between Categories 2, 3, and 4 was only 88, their totals being 294, 216, and 206 respectively. Category 5 received 162, the least of all of the Acceptable categories. It might be noticed, however, that Appropriate Reactions received only 44 less than Category 4, in which causal relationships were to be established or inferred. That was because cause and effect relationships, and the intentions or motivations of characters were reported more often when they had been stated by the author. In that

Table 15

Individual and Group Numerical Scores of Responses in Acceptable Categories

Subject	Categories					
	1	2	3	4	5	Total
No. 1	31	3	7	5	5	51
No. 2	10	3	5	4	5	27
No. 3	23	5	11	4	6	49
No. 4	8	4	3	3	3	21
No. 5	18	8	14	1	7	48
No. 6	10	4	5	3	4	26
No. 7	15	3	4	4	2	28
No. 8	20	7	8	7	7	49
No. 9	24	11	10	--	5	50
No. 10	31	11	8	--	11	61
No. 11	17	8	3	5	2	35
No. 12	19	--	--	--	5	24
No. 13	15	10	8	2	2	37
No. 14	12	6	8	7	2	35
No. 15	21	3	10	10	5	49
No. 16	21	5	10	14	6	56
No. 17	28	2	5	4	--	39
No. 18	27	11	7	4	8	57
No. 19	11	14	11	11	4	51
No. 20	19	7	2	8	2	38
No. 21	19	16	2	2	3	42
No. 22	6	13	2	11	9	41
No. 23	24	16	15	7	6	68
No. 24	35	16	13	4	2	70
No. 25	30	--	2	11	--	43
No. 26	16	4	5	2	4	31
No. 27	13	12	--	3	--	28
No. 28	40	12	4	6	5	67
No. 29	12	--	--	4	6	22
No. 30	28	11	5	--	2	46
No. 31	10	9	--	--	4	23
No. 32	7	4	--	2	2	15
No. 33	8	12	3	3	4	30
No. 34	3	8	4	3	3	21
No. 35	14	17	8	10	1	50
No. 36	30	8	6	10	7	61
No. 37	22	8	5	19	1	55
No. 38	6	2	--	3	12	23
No. 39	27	1	3	10	--	41
Total	730	294	216	206	162	1608

1. Accurate Reconstruction
2. Recognizing Experiences
3. Understanding Characters
4. Recognizing Relationships
5. Appropriate Reactions

case responses containing them were placed in Category 1.

With the exception of Category 1, no responses were made by a number of subjects in each of the categories. Three had none placed in Category 2, six had none in Category 3, five in Category 4, and four in Category 5. Because of this, numerical means were not found for the categories separately. The highest numbers in each, however, were 40, 17, 15, 19, and 12. The scores of Subjects 28, 35, 23, 37, and 38. The fact that Categories 2 to 5 were each concerned with either interpretation or reaction, while Category 1 was a literal understanding only of the facts of the stories, could account for the much higher maximum score in the first category.

The ranges and median percentages presented in Table 16 below show considerable variety. For Category 1, the range was from 14 to 79; for Category 2, it was from 2 to 43; for Category 3, from 5 to 29; for Category 4, from 2 to 34; and for Category 5, from 2 to 52. The median percentages were thus 46.5, 22.5, 17, 18, and 27.

Table 16

Ranges and Median Percentages of Responses in Acceptable Categories

	Categories				
	1	2	3	4	5
Low	14	2	5	2	2
High	79	43	29	34	52
Median	46.5	22.5	17	18	27

The unexpected result in the above table is the rank order of

the median of Category 5. That category received the lowest numerical score, but the median percentage placed it second. The reason is, of course, the 52% of Subject 38; Appropriate Reactions was the predominate kind of Acceptable response made by this subject.

Table 17 on page 97 shows individual patterns. The highest percentage in any category was the 79 of Subject 12 placed in Category 1. Only one other, Category 5, had responses from this subject. Subjects 29 and 31 have patterns almost similar, but they do have responses in a category showing deeper understanding. In addition five subjects had higher percentages placed in Category 2 than in Category 1. That meant that all but six had their highest in the first category.

Thus, it would seem that certain skills and abilities necessary for accurate comprehension of details of the stories were in the possession of the subjects to a greater or lesser degree. It would appear, too, that reproduction of such details was the primary concern with regards to providing evidence of accurate comprehension. What was second in importance proved to be a more individual matter directed by sensitivity, personal experiences and personal associations.

ESTABLISHING MISCELLANEOUS CATEGORIES

Responses which failed to communicate ideas adequately, failed to provide evidence of accurate comprehension of those ideas. The subdivisions in this main category were found to be six, each of which failed in this regard.

Table 17

Individual Percentages of Responses in Acceptable Categories

Subject	Categories					Subject	Categories				
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
No. 1	60	6	14	10	10	No. 21	45	38	5	5	7
No. 2	37	11	19	15	18	No. 22	14	32	5	27	22
No. 3	47	10	22	8	12	No. 23	35	24	22	10	9
No. 4	38	19	14	15	14	No. 24	50	23	18	5	3
No. 5	37	17	29	2	15	No. 25	70	--	5	25	--
No. 6	39	15	19	12	15	No. 26	52	13	16	6	13
No. 7	54	11	14	14	7	No. 27	46	43	--	11	--
No. 8	41	14	16	14	14	No. 28	60	18	6	9	7
No. 9	48	22	20	--	10	No. 29	55	--	--	18	27
No. 10	51	18	13	--	18	No. 30	61	24	11	--	4
No. 11	49	23	9	14	6	No. 31	44	39	--	--	17
No. 12	79	--	--	--	21	No. 32	46	27	--	14	13
No. 13	41	27	22	5	5	No. 33	27	40	10	10	13
No. 14	34	17	23	20	6	No. 34	14	38	20	14	14
No. 15	43	6	20	20	10	No. 35	28	34	16	20	2
No. 16	37	9	18	25	11	No. 36	49	13	10	16	11
No. 17	72	5	13	10	--	No. 37	40	14	10	34	2
No. 18	47	19	12	8	14	No. 38	26	9	--	13	52
No. 19	22	27	22	22	7	No. 39	66	2	7	24	--
No. 20	50	19	5	21	5						

1. Accurate Reconstruction
2. Recognizing Experiences
3. Understanding Characters
4. Recognizing Relationships
5. Appropriate Reactions

Exact quotations. Responses presenting ideas in the identical words of the author, gave inconclusive evidence that the ideas had been understood. It is possible, however, that they had been, and that the respondent felt the author expressed them better than he could. It was the same with difficult words and phrases. They were sometimes incorporated in the subject's own response, and although the contexts in which they were used were paraphrased, the difficult parts were not. There was no real evidence that the author's ideas had been grasped, or that they had not.

Ambiguous remarks. Responses which were ambiguous to the investigator were probably not ambiguous to the respondent. They did, however, contain two possible ideas, particularly with regards to the identity of the characters—it could be either of two. Having to decide in favour of one of them with insufficient evidence was avoided by putting such responses in the second Miscellaneous category.

Incomplete statements. Summaries which were far too generalized, leaving important details to be inferred, were considered to be incomplete. Paraphrase—only partly successful—of an idea taken from the story, again left it to be inferred that the complete idea had been grasped. Responses which left such inferences to the investigator comprised this group.

Irrelevant ideas. Into this category were placed those ideas which were irrelevant to the plot, or to the better understanding of the characters. They were frequently the result of apparently irrelevant associations; but occasionally ideas quite irrelevant to the

story were stimulated by the story, it would seem.

Unsubstantiated generalizations. Generalizations, predictions and inferences were counted as Acceptable when they were based on evidence available at the time, even if later they would be proven wrong. Responses placed in this group, however, contained generalizations for which no conclusive evidence of accurate comprehension could be found.

Vague, inarticulate comments. These were responses which were too inarticulate to provide clear evidence of accurate comprehension. Comments concerning the characters, their activities, the stories, or the author were all included in this group.

Examples are given below of the kinds of responses placed in each of the Miscellaneous categories.

Exact Quotations

Evidence that key words or phrases had been understood was provided by accurate translation or paraphrase. Evidence that they had not, was provided by wrong translation, or use in a wrong context. The exact quotation of difficult words or phrases gave no clear evidence that they had, or had not been understood. Accurate comprehension of the passage in which they were found thus needed to be assumed by the investigator. Responses concerned were similar to the following.

> "They seemed in a 'heavy, unnatural sleep almost like a coma.'"

The word "sleep" in the quotation would probably give it

partial meaning, but the word underlined is the key explaining "sleep." Its meaning would need to be known for precise understanding of the situation. While there is no evidence of misunderstanding, translation of either "heavy, unnatural sleep," or of "coma," would have placed the response in the first Acceptable category.

The context of the following exact quotation would seem to imply that the Indian was running away from two unpleasant situations: (1) the reservation, and (2) that "shameful bondage."

> "The Indian was running away from the reservation, and 'that shameful bondage' he would never return to."

Insufficient evidence, however, has been provided to place this response in the Deviant group. Instead such responses were placed in the first Miscellaneous category.

Ambiguous Remarks

The content of these remarks could not be decided upon with certainty, as in the following examples.

> "Kezia's mother told the Kelveys' mother that they weren't supposed to talk to them."

An accurate report of what Mrs. Burnell had said required that referents be identified for the pronouns used in the text. Since each of the pronouns in the above response could apply to the children of either family, the response was not considered to be clearly Acceptable.

> "Alfred made his mother think too much. He made him think about all the troubles he had been through."

There is ambiguity with regards to the second "he" in the above

quotation. Many such responses were made to Story 2. The whole content of the following, however, may be seen to be ambiguous.

> "He was trying to get out of the reservation because they were getting to be more white men than they were Indians."

Incomplete Statements

If an actual pattern of response were to be identified, that most often used was a detailed explanation, preceded by a general summary. Statements were sometimes made in which no details were added, and the summary too generalized for evidence of comprehension.

> "This story's about the doll house, and the girls, and how they are. This part's interesting because it tells what they do, and how they are, and how they behave."

Where facts of the stories were presented in only partially-successful paraphrase, there was again inconclusive evidence either that they had, or that they had not been recognized or understood.

> "Both Mr. Carr and Mrs. Higgins are pleased to meet each other, but not in the right way."

In order to provide evidence of comprehension the last phrase in the above example needed to be explained. In responses such as the following the specific content would need to be inferred.

> "It tells me more, and I got to knowing why he ran away."

Yet another type of response placed in this category was that which suggested knowledge and understanding, but failed to produce evidence of either. There is no indication in the following response that the content of the question, implied but not stated in the

story, had been recognized.

> "One of the little girls said she'd ask that little girl, and she went to ask her."

Irrelevant Ideas

A number of subjects showed concern for more information about the characters than had been provided by the author. While such concern can hardly be considered Deviant, on the basis of comprehension of the facts and implications in the stories, it is quite irrelevant.

> "I think Mrs. Hay might have children, or why would she have a doll house?"

If information about Mrs. Hay's family were necessary to the story, it would have been supplied by the author.

> "But where did that Indian learn to speak English? Because they didn't have any education off the reserve, and the little children didn't go to school until they had reserves."

A number, too, searched their experience for something familiar that would enable them to reconstruct that environment. They were sometimes successful.

> "It reminds me of where I used to go to school before, because that's how they treated some children over there. If they didn't like them they pushed them around."

Responses did not always provide evidence of an accurate transfer of experience; they did not, however, provide evidence that wrong associations had been aroused. Such, were then placed in the fourth Miscellaneous category.

> "It reminded me of when we were at Expo. I seen this little house—it was green. It reminded me of that."

Unsubstantiated Generalizations

Not all unsubstantiated generalizations or inferences were placed in this category. Some where Acceptable, and some were wrong. For example:

Acceptable:

> "I don't get to meet many guys like Alfred. Well, he seems to be the sort of person that gets into trouble, and that always needs somebody to look after him."

Deviant:

> "I think the Kelveys were show-offs. The eldest—well—she thought she had everything."

In addition to the above kinds, there were opinions or inferences, both unsubstantiated and apparently irrelevant, but which could not be considered Deviant.

> "It seems that his father had never helped him by giving him advice. By giving him advice in his childhood he might not have been in all this trouble."

There was also an accumulation of reactions containing adjectives used in an undifferentiated way, giving no indication of any precise concept for the words.

> "I think it's a nice story. About the house—I think it was nice; and about the people—I think they're very nice."

Although precision in the choice of adjective used by the subjects was not considered to be a criterion of accurate comprehension, when remarks were unsubstantiated and the adjectives indefinite, the responses were placed in this group.

> "They're kind people. The Burnells are very kind people. I think Mrs. Hay is

kind, and I think the Burnells were kind, too."

Responses of this kind, using such terms as "good," "bad," "nice," "kind," to describe unspecified behaviour which could not be determined with confidence, were all placed here.

Vague, Inarticulate Comments

Whether literary comments be termed criticism, evaluation, or appreciation, those placed in this category were frequently vague, generalized statements; or they were statements both subjective and inarticulate.

"I like the way they tell the story. I think it's a nice doll house, the way they make it, and the way they describe it."

Evaluation and appreciation were almost synonymous in a number of responses placed in this category. They would seem to be, in fact, expressions of satisfaction, or dissatisfaction.

"I like it. It's good. The words aren't too hard. I can understand them."

"Some parts I like it, and some parts it's sad."

"It makes me feel glad the way they tell the story."

The two last responses are representative of what was considered to be "a good story"—one that affected the reader emotionally.

"The whole story—it describes its feelings, like. The author makes it realistic—like you were there. I thought it was a real good story, both in feeling and all that."

While responses such as the one below could not possibly be considered Deviant, on the basis of accurate comprehension they could

not, either, be considered Acceptable. They could have been made on the basis of conceptual errors. While there is an attempt at literary criticism, it is really subjective—an expression of personal satisfaction, and a personal reaction to the story.

> "I thought the story was—the way they told it—I rather like the way they told it. I think I can see them doing it, and it all came to life the way they were telling it. It was all very interesting and all that. And the rest is all very fine."

The majority of attempts at literary criticism—"the way they tell the story"—were similar to the above, and were placed in this category of Miscellaneous responses, since they did not provide evidence of accurate comprehension.

COMPARISON OF MISCELLANEOUS CATEGORIES

There were 504 Miscellaneous responses according to Table 18 on page 106. Category 3 had the highest total of 147, followed closely by Category 2 with 140. The totals of the remaining categories placed Categories 5 and 6 in the next two ranks with 65 and 63 respectively. Fifth in order was Category 1 with 54, while the one to receive the lowest total was Category 4 with 35.

Individual totals ranged from 1 to 24. These were the scores of Subject 37, and both Subjects 23 and 34, who each made the same high score for this kind of response. There were thirteen who had less than 10, however, while five had 20 or more.

All but two subjects, No. 26 and No. 37, had responses placed in Category 2, and all but seven, in Category 3. The highest number

Table 18

Individual and Group Numerical Scores of Responses in Miscellaneous Categories

Subject	Categories						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
No. 1	-	3	3	-	-	1	7
No. 2	-	5	-	2	4	7	18
No. 3	-	2	6	-	-	2	10
No. 4	-	3	4	-	4	2	13
No. 5	2	7	5	-	3	2	19
No. 6	5	7	2	3	1	1	19
No. 7	-	3	8	2	2	4	19
No. 8	-	4	-	-	1	6	11
No. 9	2	5	7	-	4	4	22
No. 10	3	6	5	2	-	-	16
No. 11	-	4	-	-	7	8	19
No. 12	5	7	5	1	1	-	19
No. 13	1	1	-	-	-	5	7
No. 14	-	1	7	-	2	-	10
No. 15	-	7	1	-	1	-	9
No. 16	-	4	6	-	-	1	11
No. 17	-	3	8	-	2	-	13
No. 18	-	4	-	-	-	-	4
No. 19	2	3	5	-	-	2	12
No. 20	1	1	5	-	-	-	7
No. 21	-	3	2	-	1	3	9
No. 22	-	4	6	3	7	3	23
No. 23	-	6	8	9	1	-	24
No. 24	5	2	2	-	-	1	10
No. 25	-	3	-	-	-	-	3
No. 26	3	-	7	4	-	1	15
No. 27	-	4	3	-	-	-	7
No. 28	-	3	-	-	3	2	8
No. 29	-	3	1	-	3	1	8
No. 30	3	4	5	-	3	4	19
No. 31	3	4	5	1	-	-	13
No. 32	2	6	2	2	-	-	12
No. 33	-	2	5	3	-	-	10
No. 34	5	3	9	1	4	2	24
No. 35	1	1	4	-	-	-	6
No. 36	-	4	1	-	3	-	8
No. 37	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
No. 38	3	4	5	1	5	1	19
No. 39	8	4	4	1	3	-	20
Total	54	140	147	35	65	63	504

1. Exact Quotations
2. Ambiguous Remarks
3. Incomplete Statements
4. Irrelevant Ideas
5. Unsubstantiated Generalizations
6. Vague, Inarticulate Comments

in the first of those categories was 7, with four subjects having the same score; in Category 3, there were seven with scores of 7 or more, the highest being the 9 of Subject 34. A lack of discrimination in the use of pronouns, and an absence of precision when making statements, would seem to be habitual patterns of speech of these subjects. Such habits could be identified wherever a subject had two or more responses in a single category. They revealed a pattern used in some circumstances by that subject, and in every category there were numbers higher than two.

The highest in the remaining categories were 8 in Category 1; and 9, 7, and 8 in Categories 4, 5, and 6. They were the scores of Subjects 39, 23, and both 11 and 22. The last one was the 8 of Subject 11.

Individual patterns may be seen more easily, perhaps, in Table 20 on page 109, but immediately below is a summary of the ranges and median percentages in each of the categories.

Table 19

Ranges and Median Percentages of Responses in Miscellaneous Categories

	Categories					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Low	9	10	11	4	4	5
High	50	100	100	38	37.5	72
Median	29.5	55	55.5	21	21	38.5

The rank order of the median percentages of responses in each

category places Categories 3 and 2 in the first and second places. The highest score of each of them was 100%; and the median percentages 55.5 and 55 respectively. Category 6 had a median percentage of 38.5 and was in the third position. Category 1 was fourth, with a median of 29.5%, and Categories 4 and 5 shared the last place with medians of 21.

The ranges which gave these median percentages were from 11 to 100, and 10 to 100 for Categories 3 and 2. For Categories 6 and 1, they were from 5 to 72, and from 9 to 50. The lowest percentages for Categories 4 and 5 were 4 in each case, but there was a difference of .5% for the highest, which were 38 and 37.5 respectively.

The general pattern in Table 20 on page 109, indicates how these results were obtained. Scores of 100% were made by Subjects 18 and 25 in Category 2, and Subject 37 in Category 3. These two categories between them had the highest percentage from almost every subject. Ten had their highest in Category 2, and four others had the same in another category. Fifteen had their highest in Category 3, while three shared their's with another category. Thus for thirty-two subjects, the greatest problems were either a lack of precision in their use of words or the report of only part of an incident.

With regards to idiosyncracies, there were the usual extremes. As Subjects 18, 25 and 37, had all of their responses in only one category, so three others, Subjects 6, 34 and 38, had responses in all of them. Seven had responses placed in all but one. In addition the highest percentages of Subjects 24 and 39 were in Category 1, that of Subject 22 was in Category 5, and the 72% of Subject 13 had

Table 20

Individual Percentages of Responses in Miscellaneous Categories

Subject	Categories						Subject	Categories					
	1	2	3	4	5	6		1	2	3	4	5	6
No. 1	--	43	43	--	--	14	No. 21	--	33.3	22	--	11	33.3
No. 2	--	28	--	11	22	39	No. 22	--	18	26	13	30	13
No. 3	--	20	60	--	--	20	No. 23	--	25	33	38	4	--
No. 4	--	23	31	--	31	15	No. 24	50	20	20	--	--	10
No. 5	11	37	26	--	16	10	No. 25	--	100	--	--	--	--
No. 6	26	37	11	16	5	5	No. 26	20	--	47	27	--	6
No. 7	--	16	42	10.5	10.5	21	No. 27	--	57	43	--	--	--
No. 8	--	36	--	--	9	55	No. 28	--	37.5	--	--	37.5	25
No. 9	9	23	32	--	18	18	No. 29	--	37.5	12.5	--	37.5	12.5
No. 10	18	38	31	13	--	--	No. 30	16	21	26	--	16	21
No. 11	--	21	--	--	37	42	No. 31	23	31	38	8	--	--
No. 12	26	37	26	5	5	--	No. 32	16.6	50	16.6	16.6	--	--
No. 13	14	14	--	--	--	72	No. 33	--	20	50	30	--	--
No. 14	--	10	70	--	20	--	No. 34	21	12.5	37.5	4	17	8
No. 15	--	78	11	--	11	--	No. 35	17	17	66	--	--	--
No. 16	--	36	55	--	--	9	No. 36	--	50	12.5	--	37.5	--
No. 17	--	23	62	--	15	--	No. 37	--	--	100	--	--	--
No. 18	--	100	--	--	--	--	No. 38	16	21	26	5	26	5
No. 19	16.5	25	42	--	--	16.5	No. 39	40	20	20	5	15	--
No. 20	14	14	72	--	--	--							

1. Exact Quotations
2. Ambiguous Remarks
3. Incomplete Statements
4. Irrelevant Ideas
5. Unsubstantiated Generalizations
6. Vague, Inarticulate Comments

placed the median for Category 6 in the third place. For Subjects 2, 8, and 11, as well as for Subject 13, however, unsubstantiated, meaningless comments was the greatest cause of failing to communicate adequately. In view of the language limitations discussed above, difficulties in comprehension resulting in Deviant responses, might have been predictable.

ESTABLISHING DEVIANT CATEGORIES

All the responses in this group were termed Deviant on the basis of failing to grasp the details of the stories accurately. The result was often accumulative. Failure to grasp important details led to wrong interpretation of characters and incidents, and inappropriate attitudes were adopted.

The total group was finally broken down into six categories, which needed to remain fairly broad in order to incorporate the various kinds of errors made by the subjects.

Wrong character identification. The second category, described below, might seem to be inclusive of this one, which strictly speaking, it is. Because of the nature of this problem, a separate category was established for those responses which provided evidence of having confused the characters. Characters were identified wrongly as either the subject, or the direct or indirect object of the verb. The roles of those participating in an action were confused, and those of speaker and listener reversed. Such reactions comprised the first subcategory of Deviant responses.

Wrong report of the action. The second subdivision contained those responses which made inaccurate or erroneous reports of the action in the stories. Errors were frequently the result of projecting details into the narrative. What the characters were reported to have done or said could not be identified in the texts. Alternatively, the time sequence of the incidents reported was reversed or confused.

Misunderstanding characters. In spite of concern with the total background of the characters, the circumstances into which they were placed were not recognized in some instances. Responses which made errors in that regard were placed here. Those which contained evidence of having misunderstood the nature of the characters, or their thoughts, feelings, and attitudes were also included.

Wrong associations. Responses which indicated an erroneous transfer of personal experiences into the stories, were in this group. Such transfer had a two-fold effect. In the first place, the associated experience bore a wrong relationship to the detail reported to have evoked it. And secondly, predetermined attitudes were aroused towards the characters.

Wrong relationships established. Although the subjects showed concern with the motivation, or cause of a character's behaviour—including his intentions—the reasons given were sometimes wrong. This category contained responses in which incorrect relationships were established between the cause and effect of the behaviour of the

characters, and reported events or incidents.

Inappropriate reactions. Reactions, whether liking or disliking characters, approving or disapproving of their behaviour, or emotional reactions, were considered to be part of the total response. Where reactions were the result of inaccurate reconstruction, or of misunderstanding, the responses were placed in the appropriate category. Where no reasons were given for unexpected attitudes expressed towards the characters or the story, the responses were placed in a Miscellaneous category. But there were some reactions based on correctly-narrated facts, which could not have been evoked by an accurate understanding of those facts. These were the reactions considered to be inappropriate.

Examples of the kinds of responses placed in each of the six Deviant categories are presented below.

Wrong Character Identification

The misunderstanding of "who does what" was quite a serious problem. Failure to recognize the identity of the characters was bound to confuse the story plot.

Proper names or roles confused. The number of characters in Story 1 possibly contributed to this confusion.

> "Well, the people here are nice, except that little girl—Else [Lena]. She was always trying to get that other girl into trouble."

There was, also, confusion with regards to the roles of the characters.

> "Well, the Kelveys were hard-working little girls. They went cleaning in houses for other women. . . . Their mother worked for other people, too."

Reversal of speaker and listener. As well as confusing the agent of a reported action, the speaker and listener of direct speech were occasionally reversed.

> "It tells about Mr. Carr closing this drugstore, and Alfred telling him to take out the lipstick, compact, and two tubes of toothpaste from his pocket."

The following is an inaccurate report with regards both to the speaker, and to what he is purported to have said. The cowboy made the reference.

> "And the Indian said, 'But what about when I saved your wife and child?'"

Wrong identification of the receiver of the action. In addition to the agent or speaker, the one receiving the action was confused in some instances.

> "And the other girls laughed at Lil [Lena], so Lena was mad, and had to tell the children that her father was in jail."

Wrong Report of the Action

Reconstruction of the narrated facts of the stories was inaccurate, or false in a large number of responses. Even slight inaccuracies, however, tend to distort the original story sufficiently, to affect attitudes.

Inaccurate details. There was a number of slight inaccuracies

in reporting, which must have affected visual reconstruction of the incidents.

> "And the way the Kelvey girls dressed indicates that they are poor, because they wear curtains for their clothes."
>
> "And they carried that doll house into the courthouse."

Projection of details. Some incidents which were reported, were not in the written texts.

> "And Sam Carr said that he would fire Alfred because he's been stealing things. And Mrs. Higgins said it was a good idea. They stayed a few minutes, then Alfred said it was a good idea, too, that he was going to be fired."

Confusion of the plot sequence. The plot was confused in responses to all three stories through failure to recognize the clues given by the authors to indicate flashback.

> "And I think he [Aunt Beryl] received a letter from Willie Brent. And after frightening those Kelvey children and scolding Kezia, he read the letter from Willie Brent. And after reading the letter he went back into the house . . . I think it's funny how she went humming in the house again after reading the letter from Willie Brent."
>
> "And after, Alfred remembered that his younger sister was getting married."
>
> "So far it's pretty good, especially when the Indian went back to the reservation, because he hadn't said that he wasn't going to go back to that sick woman and child."

Reversal of time sequence. The time sequence was changed in responses to the three stories also.

> "And Kezia was just going to run when she saw the Kelveys coming, so she just stopped and wait for them."

> "Well, about the silence between the mother and Alfred—when Alfred spoke, and when the train cut him off—maybe Alfred figured that her mum wouldn't hear him when he said, 'Thank God it's over'—when the train had gone by, and he said he'd not get into a jam like that again."

> "He's been bad. He'd been getting drunk, and he shot someone. Then he was running away from the sheriff."

Many subjects, did not realize that Willis was being sought by the sheriff for having left the reservation. A change in the time sequence of his shooting a man, and his being sought would, therefore, give a logical reason for the latter.

Misunderstanding Characters

Failure to understand the characters—their nature and predispositions, their feelings and reactions—was not entirely the result of poor reading habits. A certain amount of both imagination and sensitivity was also required to experience vicariously what the fictional character experienced. Errors were made in this regard as a result of "perceiving" what had not been intended by the writer.

Wrong perception of background or circumstances. Wrong inferences appeared to have been made on the strength of statements made by the characters. These were regarded as literal facts which were then interpreted wrongly.

> "It sounds like they're poor people—the ones that received the package."

Wrong perception of the nature of the characters. The following responses may be seen to be Deviant on the basis of the evidence given.

> "Mr. Carr, I think he's mean, because when people work for him, he scolds them for what they do wrong."

Failure to recognize the historical setting of Story 3 was responsible for a number of different kinds of errors.

> "I guess the man was a robber and a thief, 'cause the woman's wife was out with the sheriff looking for a man. I guess he was the man."

Wrong perception of characters' thoughts, feelings and emotions. There would appear to be some projection of personal expectations and personal feelings on the characters in responses of this kind.

> "And when Mrs. HIggins came in, well, she never felt bad. She didn't come rushing in crying. She felt kind of happy. And Sam Carr think that Mrs. Higgins would be ashamed, but she wan't ashamed—she came in happy."

> "I think he could be persuaded to do anything, because this lady, she's sick, and she said, 'Do you have to be moving on?' And later on he told her he was going to stay for a while until she got better. I think he felt like she was a pest, or something like that."

Wrong Associations

The number of responses in this category was small in comparison to the others, but it had to be established to accommodate responses which were affected by wrongly associated experiences. Attitudes were established or reinforced by such associations.

> "Those Kelveys seem like a girl I used to know—because she was always bossy—asking for things they don't have and things like that."

The following response was not placed in a Miscellaneous category because it has a function. It avoids saying anything related to the story, and was probably aroused by the words of Mr. Carr, "I'll just fire him and let it go at that." Many subjects translated the idiom wrongly. They reported that Mr. Carr fired Alfred and let Alfred go.

> "It reminds me about last summer. There was a whole bunch of us. There was my aunties—oh, they're quite young though. And there's the whole neighbourhood, girls and boys. We each had a horse, and we each started riding our horses up to this well. And we made a great big bonfire. And we had some gas, and we throw some in there. And it all come up, and—I dunno—we all ran away."

The respondent would appear to have seized on the words "fire Alfred," to associate the memory of a bonfire, as well as throwing on gas, and [letting it go] so that it [flames] all came up high. The reason for placing this response in a Deviant category is the evidence that it contains of complete failure to grasp ideas from the story. The response seems to be a substitution for something unknown.

Association of Story 3 with Western films seen on the television aroused unjustified, stereotyped expectations.

> "I don't think I like him because he's bad. He must be bad 'cause he's running away."

The association was verbalized in some instances.

Wrong Relationships Established

The subjects did attempt to find the causal relationship between the characters, and the action, or behaviour reported. They were not always successful, however, in recognizing a character's intention or motivation, or the cause or result of his decisions. One example only of each of these will be given.

(1) Intention.

> "It tells about Isabel and Lottie . . . and when they saw the car coming each of them ran up to their rooms and changed. I guess they're going to be more considerate when they play."

The Burnell girls had no intention of changing their behaviour. They went upstairs to change their pinafores because they were expecting visitors.

(2) Motivation.

> "Mrs. Higgins was in the kitchen making a cup of tea, and he was speaking to herself all alone in the kitchen. And Alfred was in his bedroom undressing, and he heard her mother speaking to herself. And he went downstairs to the kitchen."

Although not stated specifically, it would seem to be implied in the above quotation that Alfred went downstairs because he heard his mother talking to herself. Alfred's real motivation was to tell his mother he was proud of her.

(3) Effect and cause.

> "And Lil didn't say anything, she gave her silly smile. She didn't mind the question at all. 'Cause she might have thought that

she was being complimented about that
thing and couldn't understand."

Every subject that referred to this incident reported that Lil didn't mind the question. The tone of the narrative suggests that she should have minded, and that was probably what prompted this subject to infer the reason for her failing to do so. There are other inaccuracies in the response. Lil's "silly, shamefaced smile" had been reported as "silly," and the word that gives the clue to her feelings has been avoided. She didn't "seem to mind," and once again the word that gives the clue to her real feelings has been avoided.

The reason given as the possible one for Lil not minding the question is also worthy of note. She had been asked if she was going to be a servant when she grew up, and "thought she was being complimented." There was no stigma attached to being either a washerwoman, or a servant, in the responses of any of the subjects.

Inappropriate Reactions

The reactions placed in this group were not based on errors of narration. Such responses were placed in their appropriate categories. Nor were they based on evident failure to recognize the causal relationships or failure to understand the characters. They, too, were placed in their appropriate categories. Rather they were considered to be inappropriate in relation to the evidence provided.

Confusion of word meanings. The wrong word would appear to have been used to describe the reaction in the following response.

"This part makes me feel jealous of the
Burnells, because they're not nice."

The reaction here would appear to have been some kind of negative feeling towards the Burnells, but it was probably not jealousy.

Prescribed behaviour inappropriate. The type of behaviour suggested as likely to achieve the required change in a character took attention from the actual plot.

> "I think Alfred's mum was too kind to Alfred. And Mr. Carr should have put him in jail instead of calling his mum. I would have put in him jail and kept him in jail a long time. They should have kept him in jail a long time so he would learn not to steal again."

The disapproval of the leniency of Mrs. Higgins and Mr. Carr is not what placed this response in the Deviant category. It was considered to be an Inappropriate Reaction, because of the drastic steps considered necessary to teach Alfred not to steal again.

> "The cowboy shouldn't have told the Indian he was going to follow him and get him. I think he should have just let him go, because the Indian helped the woman and the child."

The disapproval is, again, not the reason for placing this response in a Deviant category. The subject knew the cowboy was the deputy sheriff, and knew that the Indian was wanted for killing a man. Yet the behaviour prescribed ignored both of these facts. The reason for placing it in this category is that it was prescribed for the cowboy to ignore both facts. A similar personal value orientation was made by Subject 8, but the response was placed in the Acceptable category, because the personal values held were not imposed on the cowboy.

> "I think he was innocent—because of the deed he did for the woman and child—innocent of the stabbing the man."

Inappropriate literary comments. References to specific characteristics of the stories as literary works were few, and to the authors as literary artists, even fewer. There were, however, remarks such as the following from a small number of subjects.

> "They could use more better words than 'frightened those little rats' . . . and they should describe a little more better about their clothing, instead of telling about them as if they wore rags."

The suggestion made in the following response had been implied in the story.

> "They should have added a little more to the ending. I would have it that Alfred would have another job, and would do no more stealing."

The Deviant responses were all separated into one of the categories described above. Those in each group were counted, and the results tabulated. The findings have been discussed in the following section.

COMPARISON OF DEVIANT CATEGORIES

The numbers in each of the Deviant categories may be seen in Table 21, on page 122. There were 781 responses in all six categories, which makes a mean of 20 for each subject.

Category 2, Wrong Report of the Action, received 325 responses, almost half the total, and twice as many as Category 5. That was the next highest, with 161 Wrong Relationships Established between

Table 21

Individual and Group Numerical Scores of Responses in Deviant Categories

Subject	Categories						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
No. 1	-	10	3	-	4	-	17
No. 2	2	12	18	3	9	7	51
No. 3	1	6	-	-	5	-	12
No. 4	-	3	2	1	6	-	12
No. 5	3	10	6	-	4	2	25
No. 6	6	16	4	-	9	-	35
No. 7	-	4	1	-	1	3	9
No. 8	2	9	-	-	6	-	17
No. 9	2	11	3	1	-	2	19
No. 10	6	21	3	2	5	2	39
No. 11	1	14	11	4	7	-	37
No. 12	-	7	10	-	-	-	17
No. 13	-	5	2	-	2	-	9
No. 14	-	3	6	1	7	2	19
No. 15	2	6	-	-	2	-	10
No. 16	-	3	3	-	8	-	14
No. 17	2	8	5	-	13	3	31
No. 18	4	9	6	5	3	3	30
No. 19	-	3	8	-	6	-	17
No. 20	1	6	5	-	2	-	14
No. 21	6	22	8	6	9	2	53
No. 22	-	4	10	3	4	1	22
No. 23	-	20	4	3	3	7	37
No. 24	-	16	6	-	8	-	30
No. 25	-	7	-	-	2	-	9
No. 26	-	11	-	1	-	4	16
No. 27	-	4	-	-	3	-	7
No. 28	-	6	5	-	4	-	15
No. 29	-	6	1	-	2	-	9
No. 30	4	15	7	-	6	-	32
No. 31	2	4	-	2	-	-	8
No. 32	3	5	-	-	3	-	11
No. 33	1	-	-	-	-	7	8
No. 34	-	-	-	-	-	-	--
No. 35	3	5	-	2	6	2	18
No. 36	-	13	4	-	6	-	23
No. 37	2	8	3	-	5	-	18
No. 38	3	3	5	-	1	-	12
No. 39	6	10	3	-	-	-	19
Total	62	325	152	34	161	47	781

1. Wrong Character Identification
2. Wrong Report of the Action
3. Misunderstanding the Characters
4. Wrong Associations
5. Wrong Relationship Established
6. Inappropriate Reactions

characters and events. Category 3, responses in which there was evidence of Misunderstanding the Characters, was third, with a total of 152. The remaining three categories each had less than 100. They were Wrong Character Identification with 62, Inappropriate Reactions with 47, and Wrong Associations with 34.

Individual totals ranged from zero to 53. The highest was that of Subject 21, followed closely by Subject 2, whose total was 51. Attention has already been drawn to the score of Subject 34, who had none. Seven other subjects had less than 10, but ten had totals of 30 or more.

Since Category 2 had such a high number, it might have been expected that all of the subjects had responses in that category. Such, however, was not the case. Subject 34, of course, did not, but neither did Subject 33. Subject 21, again with the highest number, had 22, while Subjects 10 and 23 had 21 and 20 respectively.

With reference to the scattered nature of the responses in Table 18, it had been remarked that there seemed to be no specific pattern. The same remark might be passed with regard to Table 21, and the same observation made—that individual patterns were revealed when two or more responses were placed in the same category. Ideas were expressed which had no foundation in the story, and they comprised more than half of the errors made. And this kind of inaccurate reporting would seem to be an established pattern for all but two of the subjects.

Attention might be drawn to the nature of Category 1 on page 122, in which characters had been wrongly identified as agents or

speakers by twenty-one subjects. This was mainly due to their inability to identify referents or antecedents of pronouns, and this seems to be the pattern of at least seventeen subjects.

Table 22

Ranges and Median Percentages of Responses in Deviant Categories

	Categories					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Low	2	16	8	5	8	4
High	31	78	59	25	57	87
Median	16.5	47	33.5	15	32.5	45.5

The rank order of the median percentages, as seen in Table 22, places Category 2 first with 47. The lowest percentage was that of Subject 14, and the highest that of Subject 25. The 87% of Inappropriate Reactions was the score of Subject 33, and was responsible, together with the 4% of Subject 21, for the median of 45.5% in that category. There is only 1% difference between the medians of Categories 3 and 5. That of the former is 33.5, and of the latter, 32.5. Both of these categories are interpretational, and both indicate the median percentage of this kind of error to be approximately one third of the total.

The range in Category 1 was from 2% to 31%. The median, therefore, was 16.5, which was the fifth in rank order. The last, was the 15% in Category 4. The highest percentage in that category was 25, and the lowest, 5. As may be seen in Table 23 on page 125, however,

Table 23

Individual Percentages of Responses
in Deviant Categories

Subject	Categories						Subject	Categories					
	1	2	3	4	5	6		1	2	3	4	5	6
No. 1	--	59	18	--	23	--	No. 21	11	42	15	11	17	4
No. 2	4	24	35	6	18	13	No. 22	--	18	45	14	18	5
No. 3	8	50	--	--	42	--	No. 23	--	54	11	8	8	19
No. 4	--	25	17	8	50	--	No. 24	--	53	20	--	27	--
No. 5	12	40	24	--	16	8	No. 25	--	78	--	--	22	--
No. 6	17	46	11	--	26	--	No. 26	--	69	--	6	--	25
No. 7	--	44	11	--	11	33	No. 27	--	57	--	--	43	--
No. 8	12	53	--	--	35	--	No. 28	--	40	33	--	27	
No. 9	11	58	16	5	--	10	No. 29	--	67	11	--	22	--
No. 10	15	54	8	5	13	5	No. 30	12	47	22	--	19	--
No. 11	2	38	30	11	19	--	No. 31	25	50	--	25	--	--
No. 12	--	41	59	--	--	--	No. 32	27	46	--	--	27	--
No. 13	--	56	22	--	22	--	No. 33	13	--	--	--	--	87
No. 14	--	16	32	5	37	10	No. 34	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 15	20	60	--	--	20	--	No. 35	17	28	--	11	33	11
No. 16	--	21.5	21.5	--	57	--	No. 36	--	57	17	--	26	--
No. 17	6	26	16	--	42	10	No. 37	11	44	17	--	28	--
No. 18	13	30	20	17	10	10	No. 38	25	25	42	--	8	--
No. 19	--	18	47	--	35	--	No. 39	31	53	16	--	--	--
No. 20	7	43	36	--	14	--							

1. Wrong Character Identification
2. Wrong Report of the Action
3. Misunderstanding Characters
4. Wrong Associations
5. Wrong Relationship Established
6. Inappropriate Reactions

only thirteen subjects had responses placed in this group.

While Subject 39 is the only one whose percentage in Category 1 is more than 30, four others have 20% or more. In Category 2 there are sixteen with 50% or more. Yet these categories are concerned with a literal understanding of the facts of the stories. The results would suggest that almost two-thirds of the subjects were facing basic reading problems.

In Category 3 the score of Subject 12 was over 50%, and those of three others were more than 40%. Interpretational problems would seem to have been caused by inaccurate understanding of the characters' experiences. Had the sentence structure been familiar, however, the "understandings" may not have been either partially correct or completely wrong. But punctuation symbols, particularly those indicating sentence endings, were frequently ignored.

SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

This chapter examined the numbers of the reactions to the three stories separately, and compared the Acceptable, Miscellaneous, and Deviant responses made to each one. The responses were then divided into categories within the three main groups, and the numbers and percentages found in each were analyzed and discussed.

During the analysis, various factors had been identified which were responsible for inhibiting accurate comprehension of the fictional experiences. They also affected the attitudes of the subjects towards the characters and the plot. Analysis of these factors, therefore, was undertaken, which is discussed in Chapter five.

Chapter 5

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA—FACTORS INHIBITING COMPREHENSION

This chapter reports the attempt to identify gaps, and causes of gaps, between ideas on the printed page and the ability of the subjects to understand and interpret them. It is comprised of four divisions: (1) the reason for making the analysis, (2) the establishment and comparison of the major categories, (3) the establishment and comparison of the subcategories, and (4) a summary of the chapter.

BASIS FOR ANALYSIS

Reactions placed in the first category of Acceptable responses contained evidence of accurate observation of the facts of the stories. Those placed in the first two subcategories of Deviant responses, however, showed that even at the literal level of comprehension, essential facts had not been grasped by a number of the subjects.

Repeated unsuccessful attempts were made to create categories of misunderstandings and misinterpretations of these essential facts. They were abandoned, however, since single responses frequently contained a number of errors which were interrelated, and seemed to be either causes or effects of each other. It was difficult to decide which was a cause, and which an affect.

In order to demonstrate the difficulty encountered trying to make valid categories of apparently incongruous reporting, a single example has been given. It is comprised of reactions to section 4 of

Story No. 1. Quotations from that story, therefore, precede the subject's response.

> Emmie swallowed in a very meaningful way . . .
>
> "It's true - it's true - its true," said she.
>
> "Is it true you're going to be a servant when you grow up?" shrilled Lena.
>
> Lil only gave her silly, shamefaced smile. She didn't seem to mind the question.
>
> What a sell for Lena! The girls began to titter. Lena couldn't stand that. "Yah, your father's in prison!" she hissed spitefully.

Subject 35 made the following response to the passage from which the above quotations were taken.

> "She told her she was going to be a servant when she grew up. It proved to me that they were—well, they were mean. And when Lil just gave them a little smile, Emmie didn't seem to like it. In fact she sneered at her and told her that her father was in jail—was a jailbird."

The first error could have been confusion between the meanings of "shrilled" and "told"; it could have been failure to recognize the punctuation symbol indicating a question; or it could have been misunderstanding the difference between Emmie's "It is true," and Lena's "Is it true?". The error could not be identified with certainty as any of these; all combined would seem to have contributed to the inaccurate reconstruction in the first statement.

The second error is a generalization based on insufficient evidence. Of itself, a remark that Lil was going to be a servant has

nothing "mean" in it. In view of the wrong identification of the character, however, the second error would seem to be an attempt to point out the meanness of Emmie, as understood by recognition of mean in meaningful.

Avoidance of the key words used to describe Lil's smile was probably necessary for a rational reconstruction of the remainder of the passage, but the description contained the clue to Lil's real feelings.

There is obvious confusion between Lena and Emmie, but since "meanness" was associated with Emmie her name was probably more readily remembered. And Lena did not object to Lil's smile. She objected to the girls laughing at her apparently unsuccessful attempt to hurt Lil.

The real misunderstanding, however, was the result of unfamiliar words and phrases—ideas—which cannot be ignored without changing the meaning of what remained. The idiom, which explains what caused the little girls "to titter," has clearly been avoided, as well as the verb "to titter." The closing of this gap—unnoticed because unknown—is the real misunderstanding.

It was apparent that the original cause of the errors made by the subjects would not necessarily be found in the responses themselves. In that case, content analysis for the purpose of identifying them would seem to be devious. Analysis of the factors which caused them, however, could be a useful undertaking. Further examination of the responses was undertaken, therefore, to explore possible causes of mistakes, that could be corrected through teaching.

Exploration of Factors

The essential elements of an accurate reproduction of an incident or an event, are the correct identification of the participants in the action, and a correct report of the action itself. These essential facts, however, were frequently not grasped. On the other hand it would seem that ideas had been "read into" the stories, possibly as a result of previous personal experience, or present expectations. There was evidence that both cultural and linguistic cues had been either disregarded or avoided. There was evidence, too, of an insufficient functional knowledge of both the written and the oral language codes, and of an unsophisticated approach to the reading of literature.

In spite of the hundreds of times the doll's house was spoken of by the total group of subjects, it was referred to each time as "the doll house"—the apostrophe had been ignored. When it was used in the texts to denote possession, it was again ignored. It is doubtful if the omission affected comprehension in the first example, but in the second Wrong Report of the Action was the result. Many such examples seemed to suggest that certain subjects were totally unaware of the function of punctuation symbols. They projected their own oral language habits into the reading material, even the indiscriminate use of the forms of either gender of the personal pronoun. Such speech errors provided evidence that knowledge was lacking of the function of linguistic form and structure.

For reasons such as those given above, all of the responses—Acceptable and Miscellaneous, as well as Deviant—were re-examined,

and those containing wrong or unexpected ideas in relation to the stories, wrong or unconventional speech patterns, invalid or unusual interpretations, were separated from the data. Some were correct with regards to comprehension of the facts of the stories, but were incorrect regarding specific linguistic knowledge, and inaccurate in its use. In others there was a number of errors, and it was impossible to decide if the deviance were the result of a single one, or of all of them.

All factors found in the data to have been the cause of errors, were considered likely to cause future errors even where there had been no evidence provided of inaccurate comprehension. These included the errors in oral language made in responses considered to be Acceptable, and the ambiguity in those which had been termed Miscellaneous.

Comparison of Factors

As may be seen in Table 24 below, there are differences between the lowest numbers of factors found in the responses to the three stories, as well as between the highest, but they are not very great.

Table 24

Ranges and Mean Numerical Scores of Potentially Inhibiting Factors in Responses to Each Story

	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3
Low	9	2	1
High	63	69	62
Mean	25	18	11

The lowest for Story 1 was 9, while it was 2 for Story 2, and 1 for Story 3. The one with the highest individual total was Story 2, with 69. The highest for Story 1 was 63, and for Story 3 it was 62.

There are noticeable differences, however, between the mean numerical scores. For Story 1 it is 25, for Story 2 it is 18, and for Story 3, 11. These differences, of course, are caused by the totals of 980 for Story 1, 691 for Story 2, and 420 for Story 3, which may be seen in Table 25 on page 133. The grand total was 2091.

The most striking fact in Table 25 is the difference of over 500 between the totals of Story 1 and Story 3. That of Story 2 was an approximate median between the two. And individual totals are of the same variety, ranging from the 17 of Subject 29, to the 118 of Subject 17. Three had less than 20, while the totals of four were over a hundred. The numerical mean for the subject sample was 53.6.

For twenty-nine subjects, the greatest number of factors was found in the responses to Story 1. That story would seem to have been the most difficult for the majority of subjects. Eight, however, had their highest number in the responses to Story 2, while for Subjects 6 and 21, the greatest problems would seem to have been found in Story 3. These were the only two subjects with more than 20 for that story, the former having 27, and the latter 62.

Conversely, since twenty-five subjects had their lowest numbers in the responses to Story 3, it might have been expected that that story was the least difficult of the three. For Subject 21, however, the lowest was for Story 1, and for eleven other subjects it was in the responses to Story 2. Subjects 4 and 13 had similar low scores

Table 25

Individual and Group Numerical Scores of Inhibiting Factors in Responses to Each Story

Subject	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3	Total	Subject	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3	Total
No. 1	27	21	10	58	No. 21	22	28	62	112
No. 2	63	20	19	102	No. 22	30	13	4	47
No. 3	24	14	3	41	No. 23	29	22	16	67
No. 4	23	4	4	31	No. 24	34	13	5	52
No. 5	55	10	11	76	No. 25	20	11	7	38
No. 6	24	9	27	60	No. 26	14	5	11	30
No. 7	15	12	3	30	No. 27	20	15	2	37
No. 8	24	21	13	58	No. 28	24	11	15	50
No. 9	22	28	11	61	No. 29	9	3	5	17
No. 10	51	41	11	103	No. 30	28	20	12	60
No. 11	33	25	18	76	No. 31	10	3	6	19
No. 12	16	18	13	47	No. 32	19	15	1	35
No. 13	23	5	5	33	No. 33	23	5	12	40
No. 14	23	38	13	74	No. 34	12	2	4	18
No. 15	16	6	5	27	No. 35	21	14	13	48
No. 16	20	4	8	32	No. 36	30	11	17	58
No. 17	39	69	10	118	No. 37	39	42	10	91
No. 18	24	13	14	51	No. 38	22	52	2	76
No. 19	23	6	2	31	No. 39	17	27	5	49
No. 20	12	15	11	38					
					Total	980	691	420	2091

for Stories 2 and 3.

Nevertheless the results do indicate that Story 1 contained the most elements conducive to becoming sources of conceptual errors, and Story 3 contained the least. The first story required more adjustment on the part of the subjects, to its style and content, than either of the other two. The last story, it would seem, required less.

ESTABLISHING CATEGORIES OF INHIBITING FACTORS

Examination of the responses uncovered a variety of individual errors. Comparison of the errors with each other in some cases revealed a common cause, however, and three main kinds of factors, apparently common, seemed to be preventing successful comprehension of the written selections. The responses were then divided into three main groups according to these factors.

Experiential factors. This category was established because of the apparent failure of the subjects to recognize the experiences presented in the stories. This would seem to have been the result, in some cases, of insufficient knowledge of the background of the stories—the social, ethical or historical setting—or of the values and beliefs inherent in them. They were read, therefore, in the context of the personal backgrounds of the subjects. Memories of personal experiences were aroused, which resulted often in an unsuccessful transfer of ideas and attitudes into the stories. In addition there seemed to be specific expectations regarding the role of literature, and the method of its presentation. Some subjects, therefore,

did not recognize the clues and other techniques used by the authors to give meaning to the experiences. Where any of these factors were identified, they were considered to be the result of personal experience.

Linguistic factors. Errors in word usage, or the use of ungrammatical or unconventional sentence structure by the subjects to express ideas from the stories, were counted in this category, as well as semantical and syntactical errors. Those also were included which indicated a lack of familiarity with the vocabulary or syntax used by the authors.

Reading factors. The mistakes in this category appeared to be the result of insufficient knowledge and experience, with relation to the process of reading, and the skills and abilities required to pursue it. Difficulties were apparent in the attempts made to manipulate the written verbal symbols, and in the failure to recognize the conventional techniques of the written language. There were various kinds of errors in word recognition, and in the ideas apparently only partially recognized. Punctuation seemed to have been ignored frequently; and a number of errors resulted from inability to unravel difficult or complex sentences.

All of the responses were examined, and factors identified which seemed to be the causes of inaccurate or deviant reactions. The factors were counted, and the numerical scores turned into percentages for easier comparison. The variety of numbers for each category and for each story made this advisable. The results were then tabulated

and are presented in Table 27 on page 137.

In Table 26 presented below differences are again apparent, not only with regards to the highest and lowest in each category, but also in the ranges of percentages in each. The highest of any is the score of Subject 27—81% in the Linguistic group. That score made the median percentage much higher for this than for the other two groups.

Table 26

Ranges and Median Percentages of Inhibiting Factors in Each Category

	Experiential	Linguistic	Reading
Low	10	15	8
High	56	81	56
Median	33	48	32

It may be seen that Experiential and Reading factors have almost identical scores. The only difference is the 2% less for the lowest score in the Reading category. This affected the median percentage by 1, making it just less than that of the Experiential category.

Since the rank order of the medians places the percentage of Linguistic factors in the highest place, it might have been expected that the highest percentages of the scores of most of the subjects would be in that category, and for twenty-three of them that is the case. For Subject 20, however, this position is shared with Reading, and for Subject 28, with Experiential, as may be seen in Table 27 on page 137. Of the remaining fourteen, seven have their highest

Table 27

Individual Percentages of Inhibiting Factors in Each Category

Subject	Categories Exp.	Ling.	Read.	Subject	Categories Exp.	Ling.	Read.	Subject	Categories Exp.	Ling.	Read.
No. 1	14	74	12	No. 14	24	66	10	No. 27	11	81	8
No. 2	56	15	29	No. 15	22	48	30	No. 28	40	40	20
No. 3	20	51	29	No. 16	19	47	34	No. 29	29	47	24
No. 4	36	45	19	No. 17	24	66	10	No. 30	25	32	43
No. 5	31	49	20	No. 18	39	35	26	No. 31	11	63	26
No. 6	48	22	30	No. 19	23	48	29	No. 32	17	54	29
No. 7	20	50	30	No. 20	32	34	34	No. 33	30	40	30
No. 8	28	52	20	No. 21	26	20	54	No. 34	22	56	22
No. 9	31	38	31	No. 22	30	40	30	No. 35	10	42	48
No. 10	18	50	32	No. 23	45	36	19	No. 36	42	29	29
No. 11	46	20	34	No. 24	29	38	33	No. 37	11	76	13
No. 12	34	30	36	No. 25	19	34	47	No. 38	12	32	56
No. 13	15	55	30	No. 26	43	23	33	No. 39	14	39	47

percentages in the Experiential category, and seven in the Reading.

The major problems would seem to be linguistic ones for this sample of subjects, even though seven found their greatest difficulty in the actual reading of the stories, and seven others in the historical, ethical, or cultural backgrounds. In view of this fact, the occasional projection of familiar oral language habits into the reading of the stories is not surprising. What is surprising, however, is the extent of successful adjustment to the less familiar language code in the written texts. The category of Acceptable responses it may be remembered, was by far the largest. And while it was predominantly comprised of reconstruction of the details of the stories, it was accurate reconstruction.

It might be well at this point to draw attention to the percentages of inhibiting factors found in the responses of Subject 34. This was the only subject with none in a Deviant category. There were more, however, in the Miscellaneous than in the Acceptable category, and factors were present which appeared to have been responsible for the Deviant responses of other subjects. They were, therefore, potentially inhibiting factors, and this was the main reason for lack of certainty regarding accuracy, which placed them in a Miscellaneous category.

COMPARISON OF FACTORS IN EACH CATEGORY

The total group was seen to have the highest percentage of Linguistic factors, with Experiential second and Reading just behind. Each of the stories was next looked at in terms of a single category

to discover which stories had uncovered which factors.

Experiential Factors

The summary in Table 28 below shows very marked differences in the ranges and median percentages of Experiential factors found in the responses to each of the stories.

Table 28

Ranges and Median Percentages of Experiential Factors in Responses to Each Story

	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3
Low	11	8	7
High	100	78	66
Median	55	43	36.5

The range for Story 1 is from 11% to 100%, the scores of Subjects 38 and 31. That for Story 2 is from 8% to 78%, the scores of Subjects 5 and 38. And the one for Story 3 is from 7% to 66%, the scores of Subjects 17 and 21. The median in each case was 55%, 43% and 36.5%.

Individual percentages are shown in Table 29 on page 140. It might be noticed that while the highest percentage for Story 3 was 66, the second highest was 50, and the third, 44. There were, however, twenty-two scores of 50% or more in the responses to Story 1, and nine such scores in the responses to Story 2.

One further point might be worthy of note. Every subject had Experiential problems with Story 1, but three had none with Story 2, and five had none with Story 3. It would appear from these results,

Table 29

Individual Percentages of Experiential Factors
in Responses to Each Story

Subject	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3	Subject	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3	Subject	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3
No. 1	75	--	25	No. 14	44	28	28	No. 27	50	50	--
No. 2	56	23	21	No. 15	50	17	33	No. 28	60	25	15
No. 3	62.5	25	12.5	No. 16	50	17	33	No. 29	60	20	20
No. 4	73	9	18	No. 17	36	57	7	No. 30	47	26.5	26.5
No. 5	63	8	29	No. 18	40	30	30	No. 31	100	--	--
No. 6	48	17	35	No. 19	57	29	14	No. 32	50	50	--
No. 7	17	66	17	No. 20	33	59	8	No. 33	50	25	25
No. 8	56	19	25	No. 21	17	17	66	No. 34	25	25	50
No. 9	47	21	32	No. 22	57	29	14	No. 35	40	60	--
No. 10	63	26	11	No. 23	20	50	30	No. 36	50	12.5	37.5
No. 11	43	23	34	No. 24	67	13	20	No. 37	50	20	30
No. 12	25	31	44	No. 25	71	29	--	No. 38	11	78	11
No. 13	80	--	20	No. 26	31	31	38	No. 39	14	72	14

that the problems posed by the background and culture, the ideas and beliefs in Story 1, were the most difficult for the majority of subjects, and those in Story 2, the next.

Linguistic Factors

There is no doubt of the story which caused the greatest linguistics problems, according to Table 30 below.

Table 30

Ranges and Median Percentages of Linguistic Factors in Responses to Each Story

	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3
Low	23	7	5
High	87	63	46
Median	55	35	25.5

The lowest percentage of linguistic factors in the responses to Story 1 was 23. This was the score of each of Subjects 14, 20, and 21. Subject 2 had the highest score of 87%. For Story 2 the range was from 7% to 63%, the scores of Subjects 16 and 14 respectively; and for Story 3, it was from 5% to 46%. The former was the score of both Subjects 3 and 24; the latter, of Subjects 6 and 20. The median percentages for the three stories were 55, 35, and 25.5.

The individual percentages in Table 31 on page 142 reinforce the pattern suggested above. Fourteen had percentages for Story 1 higher than the highest for Story 2; and those of twenty-eight were higher for the first story than the highest for Story 3. That was

Table 31

Individual Percentages of Linguistic Factors
in Responses to Each Story

Subject	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3	Subject	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3	Subject	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3
No. 1	49	39	12	No. 14	23	63	14	No. 27	53	40	7
No. 2	87	13	--	No. 15	62	38	--	No. 28	30	25	45
No. 3	62	33	5	No. 16	80	7	13	No. 29	50	25	25
No. 4	72	14	14	No. 17	32	62	6	No. 30	26	53	21
No. 5	78	16	6	No. 18	78	11	11	No. 31	59	8	33
No. 6	39	15	46	No. 19	80	13	7	No. 32	74	26	--
No. 7	47	40	13	No. 20	23	31	46	No. 33	69	--	31
No. 8	33	47	20	No. 21	23	45	32	No. 34	70	10	20
No. 9	39	61	--	No. 22	63	26	11	No. 35	65	20	15
No. 10	45	39	16	No. 23	84	8	8	No. 36	76	24	--
No. 11	60	27	13	No. 24	70	25	5	No. 37	39	54	7
No. 12	50	36	14	No. 25	62	--	38	No. 38	67	33	--
No. 13	61	17	22	No. 26	57	14	29	No. 39	53	32	15

not the pattern in every case, however. Seven subjects found the greatest number of linguistic problems in relation to Story 2, while Subjects 6, 20, and 28 found that to be so in relation to Story 3.

Nevertheless, it might be noticed again that every subject was involved with linguistic problems in his responses to Story 1. But two found none with Story 2, and six found none with Story 3.

Reading Factors

The ranges and median percentages of specific factors shown in Table 32 below, show little variation from those in Tables 28 and 30 on pages 139 and 141. There was another 100% score in the responses to Story 1. It was that of Subject 34. The lowest for that story was the 12% of Subject 38. Its median percentage was thus 56, the highest yet for any of the categories.

Table 32

Ranges and Median Percentages of Reading Factors in Responses to Each Story

	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3
Low	12	10	2
High	100	86	61
Median	56	48	31.5

Story 2 also had its highest median percentage of the three categories, in this category. Its lowest score was 10%, that of Subject 28; and its highest 86%, that of Subject 38, making the median percentage 48. The lowest percentage for Story 3 was very much lower

Table 33

Individual Percentages of Reading Factors
in Responses to Each Story

Subject	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3	Subject	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3	Subject	Story 1	Story 2	Story 3
No. 1	--	57	43	No. 14	57	29	14	No. 27	67	33	--
No. 2	60	17	23	No. 15	62.5	--	37.5	No. 28	60	10	30
No. 3	50	42	8	No. 16	45	18	37	No. 29	50	--	50
No. 4	83	17	--	No. 17	33	42	25	No. 30	62	23	15
No. 5	74	13	13	No. 18	15	39	46	No. 31	20	40	40
No. 6	28	11	61	No. 19	78	22	--	No. 32	20	70	10
No. 7	78	22	--	No. 20	38	31	31	No. 33	50	17	33
No. 8	42	33	25	No. 21	20	21	59	No. 34	100	--	--
No. 9	21	53	26	No. 22	71	29	--	No. 35	26	30	44
No. 10	48	48	4	No. 23	23	38.5	38.5	No. 36	29	24	47
No. 11	35	50	15	No. 24	59	35	6	No. 37	58	25	17
No. 12	29	47	24	No. 25	39	50	11	No. 38	12	86	2
No. 13	80	20	--	No. 26	60	--	40	No. 39	26	70	4

than either of those for the other two stories. It was 2%, the score of Subject 38. Subject 6 had 61% in this category, and that was the highest percentage for Story 3, making its median 31.5%.

The individual pattern of Subject 38 is completed in Table 32. This subject had the lowest scores for both Story 1 and Story 3, and the highest for Story 2. A greater number, in fact almost all, the reading problems of this subject were encountered with regards to Story 2.

Table 33 on page 144 shows that nine subjects had found more Reading problems in Story 2 than in the other two stories. Twenty-one found more in Story 1, and five in Story 3. On the other hand, no reading errors were found in the responses to Story 2 of four subjects, of only one to Story 1, and of six to Story 3.

Analysis has uncovered median percentages of 55 in each of the Experiential and Linguistic categories in the responses to Story 1, and of 56 in the Reading category. The median percentages for Story 2 were 43, 35, and 48; and those for Story 3 were 36.5, 25.5, and 31.5. Thus the rank order of the stories with regards to each category placed Story 1 first, Story 2 second, and Story 3 last. While that was not always the individual patterns, the greatest problems would appear to have been encountered in relation to the first story, and the least in relation to the last.

FURTHER ANALYSIS OF FACTORS

In order to make possible a more detailed analysis, sub-categories of Experiential, Linguistic, and Reading factors were established.

OUTLINE OF CATEGORIES AND SUBCATEGORIES

Experiential Factors

1. Didactic expectations.
2. Story-telling expectations.
3. Literal understandings.
4. Background of the stories.
5. Personal experiences.
6. Personal culture.
7. Predetermined attitudes.

Linguistic Factors

1. Pronoun errors.
2. Other syntactical errors.
3. Vocabulary deficiencies.
4. Dialect and idiolect.
5. Unconventional character identification.
6. Inability to translate idiom.

Reading Factors

1. Non-reading.
2. Word recognition.
3. Author's techniques.
4. Disregard of punctuation.
5. Complex sentence structure.
6. Projection of oral language.
7. Inability to identify referents.

ESTABLISHING EXPERIENTIAL CATEGORIES

It is almost an axiom to say that what a child gets from his reading will depend on what he brings to it. He brings knowledge and experience of various kinds. He brings personal values and beliefs. He brings expectations and attitudes. These may all be termed Experiential factors. Seven such subcategories of Experiential factors, which seemed to be related to the background and experiences of the subjects, were identified in the responses.

1. Didactic expectations. Many subjects either specifically stated, or clearly indicated, that they expected some moral or ethical principle to be the theme of the stories. They seemed to be overly preoccupied either with identifying unacceptable behaviour, or with suggesting what they considered to be more acceptable behaviour. This factor set a limit to the degree of recognition of the total experience likely to result from reading the stories.

2. Story-telling expectations. From the comments and reactions of the subjects, it was apparent that authors were regarded as story tellers, not as literary artists. Facts given should be credible and true-to-life. "Good" description was appreciated; and conversation, rather than reported speech, made the stories "more realistic." An affective style was expected—one capable of touching the emotions—and so was a conclusive ending. The need to be able to put themselves "into the story," appeared to be another limiting factor, however, since it encouraged the adoption of one character's role. There was

then reaction to the behaviour of the other characters rather than recognition of the total situation.

3. Literal understandings. This factor was a corollary to the one given above. The subjects accepted the facts given as the only ones necessary for the story, and understood them as they were stated. They then made comments, or reacted accordingly. Implied meanings were avoided. So, too, were the cultural cues used by the author as directives to meaning.

4. Background of the stories. Many subjects were aware of the need for background information about the characters in order to understand them better, but did not recognize what had been provided by the author. Errors showed conclusively that insufficient knowledge of the social or historical background of a story, was an added barrier to successful comprehension.

5. Personal experiences. Erroneous transfer to the characters in the story, of feelings and attitudes aroused by memories of personal experiences, was another barrier to correct understanding of the characters.

6. Personal culture. Personal values were sometimes projected into apparent recognition of the significance of the story details. Interpretations would also seem to have been based on values and beliefs not apparent in the stories.

7. Predetermined attitudes. Attitudes were not always a

response to recognized behaviour. Prejudiced attitudes towards the characters helped prevent an accurate understanding of the facts of the stories.

After the seven categories had been established, the responses were examined, and the Experiential factors identified.

Didactic Expectations

The expectations that the fictional experience be concerned with an ethical or moral aspect was found in various kinds of comments.

Concern for bad example. That a reader or listener was expected to learn something from a story was indicated frequently in remarks such as the following.

> "I would change that part . . . little kids might be influenced by it."

The lesson or change expected. The nature of the lesson, or the change expected, was stated in some instances.

> "This story tells something like you're not supposed to steal."

> "They're not friends . . . I think they'll all come friends."

Age and sex of the reader. Remarks of the subjects indicated that specific stories were meant for specific readers.

(1) According to age:

> "It's too childish . . . it's meant for kids."

(2) According to sex:

> "Girls aren't interested in stories like this . . . 'cause it's meant for boys."

Expectations such as these limit what is considered to be relevant to a particular reader. Thus attitudes to the stories are affected, as was demonstrated in remarks such as the following.

"It didn't tell me anything."

"It doesn't have any meaning to it at all."

Story-telling Expectations

It would seem to have been expected that all relevant details would be supplied by the story teller—relevant, that is, to understanding the characters, or the meaning of the story.

All details would be provided. There were numerous comments such as the following:

"I'm wondering why . . . It didn't tell why."

"They should tell more about . . ."

Many remarks were prefaced by such statements as:

"They haven't said yet."

"It didn't say in the story."

"I don't know . . . yet. It didn't tell."

There was hesitancy in supplying details that it was expected the author would supply. Callaghan had not given the details of how Sam Carr knew about Alfred's stealing, which evoked many remarks doubting Alfred's guilt.

(1) "Well, it didn't say he seen him. I'm wondering how he knew."

(2) "He's just trying to blame Alfred Higgins . . ."

References to the title. The first relevant detail was the

title of the story. It was expected to indicate the content, and indicate it clearly.

"I would change the title . . ."

"And I think the title should be wrong . . ."

Prejudiced remarks, made in response to the first sections of each of Stories No. 1 and No. 2, suggested that attitudes had been affected by the titles.

Difficulty identifying the main character. The subjects clearly indicated their expectation to have the main character, or characters, identified at the very beginning of the stories.

> "It seems to be more about a boy than 'her,' whoever she is."

The problems that arose because of this kind of misunderstanding the title of Story 2, and failing to recognize the main character, were many. Since they were partly based on a Linguistic factor they have been discussed later. Suffice it to say at this point that some of them may not have arisen, were the title not expected to give direction to their loyalties.

Literal Understandings

Enough has probably been said already to show that failure of the subjects to make inferences with regards to significances was not necessarily the result of inability to do so.

Observed facts reported as facts. The subjects did not expect to have to infer significances intended by the author. The smile of our Else—or at least the significance of the smile—was missed by

all those subjects who thought Story No. 1 was "a very sad story," or referred to the ending as "sad" or "very sad." One subject even said that our Else probably hadn't seen the lamp at all, but said that she had "just to make her sister feel better."

Implied meanings avoided. Much of Mansfield's story had deeper meanings implied by her choice of words. But such cues were deliberately avoided in some cases, because of the subjects' expectations.

> "And about the special smile. Well, I dunno about the special smile, but the special voice, well . . ."

Background of the Stories

Comments made frequently showed unawareness of the story settings as determiners of behaviour. Both the cultural setting of Story No. 1, and the historical setting of Story No. 3, were apparently unknown. The cultural behaviour in Story No. 2 was recognized, but dismissed. Because this last would seem to have been the result of the personal culture of the subjects it will be discussed later.

Cultural setting of Story No. 1. Many of the verbalized expected outcomes of this story indicated that the "social distance" with which it was concerned, was unfamiliar to the subjects. Various changes in the interpersonal relationship between the two families were anticipated by most of them. One third of the subjects expected that finally the children of the two families would become friends.

> "I think they'll all come friends."
>
> "They'll talk to the other ones now."

Another general problem caused by the cultural setting of the story was the absence of any identifiable reason for the treatment of the Kelveys. Various attempts were made by different subjects to identify a cause.

> "And why do they treat these children like this? That's what I mean to find out."

Historical setting of Story No. 3. Only two subjects correctly established the setting of Story No. 3, one of them because of familiarity with the term "jumped the reservation." The remainder were confused, and accused the Indian of being punished for bad behaviour.

> "He was sent away 'cause he was bad."

As a result of not recognizing the settings of Story No. 1 or of Story No. 3, there were misunderstandings with regards to the characters. The nature of the Kelvey children was not understood, and the Indian's motivation for leaving the reservations was not recognized.

(1) "They were disobedient."

"They did something wrong. I don't know what."

(2) ". . . and the chief sent some men to bring him back to punish him."

There were many responses such as the above which resulted from lack of familiarity with the background of the stories.

Personal Experiences

It was frequently reported that incidents or people in the stories reminded the subjects of personal experiences, or of familiar people. There was more evidence, however, that a memory had been

evoked by a word or a phrase, and the circumstances surrounding the memory were projected into the story with negative results.

Wrong interpretation. Wrong interpretation was often a result not a cause. It was, however, the cause of further misunderstanding.

> "It's not like schools now. And it seems they're rather poor, 'cause they have their lunch under a tree."

Projection of personal experience. This example was also evoked by the fictional experience of the school children eating their lunch under the trees in the playground. In this case the experience of the subject, which was a happy one, was projected into the story, and prevented comparison of the Kelvey children's lunch with those of the other children.

> ". . . makes me think about myself, because I often make cakes and cookies. It seems like they're having a party of some kind."

Characters misunderstood. Misunderstanding the nature of characters resulted, in a number of instances, from the association of some recognized word or idea, with a person within the acquaintance of the subject. The predisposition of that person was then projected on to the fictional character.

> "They [the Kelveys] remind me of George _____'s brothers . . . They always go alone."

Personal Culture

The personal culture, which to a child is "reality," proved to be a factor which prevented accurate understanding of Story No. 1 and of Story No. 2.

Parental control. An integral part of Mansfield's story was the influence of the parents on their children's behaviour. It was ignored, however, by most of the subjects. This led to criticism of the school children that was not entirely deserved, and to impossible suggestions regarding more acceptable behaviour.

(1) "Isabel's selfish . . . She won't let them listen."

(2) "They should talk to them more."

"She [Isabel] should let them Kelveys play with them."

Remarks such as the above were passed by almost half of the subjects, and by some, many times.

Group culture. Group culture, which does not look favourably on those outside the group, was projected into the first part of Story No. 1. There was also criticism for taking the girls two at a time to see the doll's house.

(1) The Kelvey girls were held responsible for being outside the group.

"They don't talk to the other ones."

"They're enemies of the children."

(2) The group should be left together.

". . . well, two at a time. She should let them all see the doll house together."

Parent-child responsibilities. Both of Alfred's parents, as well as Mr. Carr, were blamed for not giving Alfred sufficient advice. On the other hand, Alfred was supposed to make his own decisions, and take full responsibility for his actions.

> "In my opinion Mrs. Higgins should have let Alfred learn to get himself out of all the trouble he got himself into."

Mrs. Higgins was blamed for "babying" Alfred instead of "making him stand on his own feet," by many of the subjects. One even implied that she was preventing him from growing up.

> "I wish his mother'd never come. She didn't have to keep treating him as if he was still little."

Wrong interpretation of behaviour. Some of the errors made in interpreting the meaning of details in the stories, would seem to have been the result of personal culture.

Name-calling. The idea that Mr. and Mrs. Kelvey were being "called names" because they were described as a washer woman and a jailbird, was held by a surprising number of subjects.

(1) "The people act funny to these Kelveys. They call them names—like, that man and that woman."

(2) "And they're calling the mother down, too, like, something about a washerwoman."

The various connotations held for the term "name calling" might have been considered Linguistic errors. But because words like "jailbird," "washerwoman" and "servant" were considered to be spiteful terms, Name-calling seemed to be more an Experiential than a Linguistic factor.

Other interpretations which were made by a number of subjects are given below.

they shook hands — interpreted as — "he forgave Alfred's mother."

Seven subjects would seem to associate shaking hands with forgiveness.

whispering behind her hand	interpreted as	"trying to keep it a secret."

Projection of roles. Various expected roles were projected on the characters by a number of subjects. It would appear that the behaviour of the characters had suggested their roles.

> Mrs. Hay was referred to as the grandmother. She was also referred to as an aunt.
>
> Pat, the handy-man, was called the father.
>
> Willis was referred to as Chief Willis.
>
> The role of "daddy" was projected on to Willis.

In the last example quoted "daddy" would seem to have meant a provider of some kind.

Predetermined Attitudes

Attitudes were adopted towards all the characters, and expressions of liking or disliking them are scattered profusely throughout the transcriptions. So much so, in fact, that they were virtually ignored, and notice taken only of the accuracy of the facts that had evoked them. Not infrequently, however, there would seem to be no apparent reason for the attitudes adopted, other than positive attitudes towards other characters having been adopted earlier.

Towards the Kelveys. It was realized that there was some unfriendliness among the children, but a positive attitude towards the Burnell girls had already been established. Twenty-nine subjects made negative remarks about the Kelveys immediately they entered the story, and for no reason.

"I don't like the eldest one—Lil, I think her name is."

"I don't like those Kelveys, they're acting smart."

Towards Mrs. Higgins. Mrs. Higgins also suffered from predetermined attitudes, probably for the same reason as the Kelvey children. Loyalty had already been given to Alfred, and in a number of cases, it took a long time for this to change. However, the positive attitude towards the Burnell children was based on a correct understanding of the first part of Story No. 1. That towards Alfred was the result of misunderstanding the first part of Story No. 2. Attitudes towards Mrs. Higgins, therefore, were based on more complicated grounds than those towards the Kelveys, and were generally substantiated with evidence of misunderstanding. Only a few remarks such as the following were made to Story No. 2.

"And I don't like Alfred's mother."

Towards Willis. Negative attitudes were adopted by a few subjects towards the protagonist in Story No. 3, because of the stereotyped expectation of a "bad" Indian.

"I don't like him. He's bad. He must be bad 'cause he's running away."

This was a "die-hard" attitude, because the first section of the story presented a "good" Indian. The story was so designed that positive attitudes towards the Indian would be adopted from the beginning.

After all the factors described above were counted, the numbers were tabulated for the purpose of comparison.

COMPARISON OF FACTORS IN EXPERIENTIAL CATEGORIES

The numerical count of the factors in the seven Experiential categories may be seen in Table 34 on page 160. The total was 581, which makes a numerical mean of 14.9.

The highest individual total was 57, provided by Subject 2, while the lowest was the 2 of Subject 31. Sixteen had less than 10. Since the second highest was the 35 of Subject 11, the high total of Subject 2 would suggest that the experiential background of that subject was further removed from those contained in the stories than was the case with the other subjects. And that, in fact, was so. Subject 2 was in residence in the school for twelve months of the year. Very many of the responses of this subject were exploratory.

The rank order of the categories places Personal Culture first with 126. Failure to recognize the parent-child relationship in Stories No. 1 and No. 2 was responsible for that total in Category 6. Category 4, Backgrounds of the Stories, was next with 123. Failure to recognize either the social setting of Story No. 1; or the historical setting of Story No. 3 was one of the reasons. Wrong interpretation of behaviour was evident in both of these categories.

The remaining five categories had totals of less than 100; but since it was expected that the stories would give some kind of advice, it is not surprising that Category 1 was placed third. Didactic Expectations received 92. Next was Category 5 with 74, Category 2 with 66, Category 7 with 57, while the lowest was 43 in Category 3.

As might be expected from the totals, the category to which

Table 34

Individual and Group Numerical Scores of Factors in Experiential Categories

Subject	Categories							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
No. 1	1	4	--	2	--	1	--	8
No. 2	14	6	2	10	5	11	9	57
No. 3	--	2	--	3	--	2	1	8
No. 4	3	1	--	--	5	--	2	11
No. 5	6	2	5	8	--	3	--	24
No. 6	5	2	3	4	11	2	2	29
No. 7	4	--	--	1	1	--	--	6
No. 8	3	2	--	6	2	3	--	16
No. 9	5	--	3	2	1	8	--	19
No. 10	--	--	4	5	2	7	1	19
No. 11	4	4	6	9	4	8	--	35
No. 12	3	2	--	2	--	7	2	16
No. 13	1	--	1	2	--	--	1	5
No. 14	3	2	1	3	3	2	4	18
No. 15	3	--	1	--	--	1	1	6
No. 16	1	1	--	2	1	1	--	6
No. 17	2	5	4	5	2	3	7	28
No. 18	2	2	3	2	5	3	3	20
No. 19	1	1	--	2	--	2	1	7
No. 20	2	5	1	2	--	2	--	12
No. 21	3	6	1	9	6	4	--	29
No. 22	2	1	--	3	3	3	2	14
No. 23	2	1	2	8	3	11	3	30
No. 24	2	1	2	5	1	2	2	15
No. 25	--	3	--	2	1	1	--	7
No. 26	5	2	--	1	1	4	--	13
No. 27	--	--	--	--	2	2	--	4
No. 28	2	3	--	4	1	8	2	20
No. 29	1	1	--	--	--	1	2	5
No. 30	--	--	1	2	3	6	3	15
No. 31	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	2
No. 32	2	1	--	1	--	2	--	6
No. 33	2	--	--	5	2	2	1	12
No. 34	--	--	--	--	2	2	--	4
No. 35	--	--	--	1	2	1	1	5
No. 36	4	4	3	5	2	6	--	24
No. 37	1	--	--	7	--	2	--	10
No. 38	1	2	--	--	--	1	5	9
No. 39	2	--	--	--	1	2	2	7
Total	92	66	43	123	74	126	57	581

1. Didactic Expectations
2. Story-telling Expectations
3. Literal Understandings
4. Backgrounds of the Stories
5. Personal Experiences
6. Personal Culture
7. Predetermined Attitudes

most contributed was Category 6. Four subjects only had nothing in that group. There were eight with nothing in each of Categories 4 and 1.

The highest individual score in any category was the 14 of Subject 2 in Category 1. Three subjects had 11, the second highest number—Subjects 2 and 23 in Category 6, and Subject 6, in Category 5. There was thus, an habitual erroneous projection of their own expectations, knowledge, and experience into the stories in order to make them meaningful to these subjects. But individual problems varied. It might be noticed that while the responses of Subject 31 were affected by only one Experiential factor, and those of Subjects 27 and 34 by two, seven subjects were affected by them all.

Table 35

Ranges and Median Percentages of Factors in Experiential Categories

	Categories						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Low	7	3	3	8	5	7	5
High	66	50	21	70	100	50	56
Median	36.5	26.5	12	39	52.5	28.5	30.5

The widest range is from 5% to 100% in Category 5, which makes the median percentage 52.5. The highest score was that of Subject 31, whose only count was in this group. The lowest was shared by Subjects 9 and 28.

The second highest median percentage was 39 in Category 4. And

still above 30 were those of Category 1 and Category 7, with 36.5 and 30.5 respectively. Subject 37 had the highest percentage of 70 in Category 4, and Subject 26 the lowest of 8. The highest percentage in Category 1 was the 66 of Subject 7 while the lowest was the 7 of Subjects 17 and 23. Category 7 had 56 as its highest individual percentage, the score of Subject 38; and its lowest was 5, the score of Subject 10.

Subjects 27 and 34 shared the highest place with percentages of 50 in Category 6, and Subject 6 had the lowest with 7. The highest percentage in Category 2 was also 50, the score of Subject 1; the lowest was 3, the score of Subject 23. Finally, the 3% and 21% in Category 3, were the scores of Subject 21 for the lowest, and of both Subjects 5 and 10 for the highest. The medians of Categories 6, 2, and 3 were 28.5%, 26.5%, and 12% respectively.

Individual percentages may be seen in Table 36 on page 163. While a definite group pattern cannot be identified, it may be noticed that twelve subjects had their highest percentage in Category 4, two of whom had the same percentage in another category also. Thirteen had their highest in Category 6, six of whom had a similar score elsewhere. In other words twenty-five of the thirty-nine subjects—almost two-thirds—found their greatest difficulty in Category 4, Background of the Stories, or Category 6, Personal Culture. Category 3, Literal Understanding, did not have the highest percentage of any subject.

The diversity in Table 36 shows that even with a specific kind of inhibiting factor such as an Experiential one, there were individual problems. Those of any of the subjects would seem to have been shared

Table 36

Individual Percentages of Factors in Experiential Categories

Subject	Categories						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No. 1	12.5	50	--	25	--	12.5	--
No. 2	25	10	4	18	9	19	15
No. 3	--	25	--	38	--	25	12
No. 4	27	9	--	--	46	--	18
No. 5	25	8	21	33	--	13	--
No. 6	18	7	10	13	38	7	7
No. 7	66	--	--	17	17	--	--
No. 8	19	12.5	--	37	12.5	19	--
No. 9	26	--	16	11	5	42	--
No. 10	--	--	21	26	11	37	5
No. 11	11	11	18	26	11	23	--
No. 12	20	12	--	12	--	44	12
No. 13	20	--	20	40	--	--	20
No. 14	17	11	5	17	17	11	22
No. 15	50	--	16.6	--	--	16.6	16.6
No. 16	16.6	16.6	--	33.3	16.6	16.6	--
No. 17	7	18	14	18	7	11	25
No. 18	10	10	15	10	25	15	15
No. 19	14	14	--	29	--	29	14
No. 20	17	41	8	17	--	17	--

Subject	Categories						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No. 21	10	21	3	31	21	14	--
No. 22	14	7	--	21.4	21.4	21.4	14
No. 23	7	3	7	26	10	37	10
No. 24	13	7	13	34	7	13	13
No. 25	--	44	--	28	14	14	--
No. 26	38	15	--	8	8	31	--
No. 27	--	--	--	--	50	50	--
No. 28	10	15	--	20	5	40	10
No. 29	20	20	--	--	--	20	40
No. 30	--	--	7	13	20	40	20
No. 31	--	--	--	--	100	--	--
No. 32	33	17	--	17	--	33	--
No. 33	17	--	--	41	17	17	8
No. 34	--	--	--	--	50	50	--
No. 35	--	--	--	20	40	20	20
No. 36	17	17	13	20	8	25	--
No. 37	10	--	--	70	--	20	--
No. 38	11	22	--	--	--	11	56
No. 39	29	--	--	--	13	29	29

1. Didactic Expectations
2. Story-telling Expectations
3. Literal Understandings
4. Backgrounds of the Stories
5. Personal Experiences
6. Personal Culture
7. Predetermined Attitudes

by less than one third of the group, with the exception of Category 6. That would imply that awareness of the personal culture of the subjects might assist in recognizing their problems, and in identifying the points in the stories which might need to be explained.

ESTABLISHING LINGUISTIC CATEGORIES

Judging from the verbalized reactions to the stories, many of the subjects taking part in this study seemed unaware that syntactical forms and structures have a specific function—they are necessary for successful language communication. For that reason a limited functional knowledge of the English language was considered to be a very significant factor inhibiting accurate comprehension. The first two linguistic categories, therefore, are related to syntax and word order of conventional English.

Pronoun errors. The syntactical error found to be the most persistent was the indiscriminate use of the personal pronoun. Because of the prelevance of this error, a subcategory was established for it alone.

Other syntactical errors. Tenses of verbs were confused, and there was lack of agreement in number with their subjects. Indiscriminate use of function words was not so general as of pronouns, but there was confusion regarding those used to indicate the relationship between ideas. Word order was changed occasionally, thus altering the causal relationship indicated by the function words as they were used in the stories.

Vocabulary deficiencies. Words were used in contexts which made it apparent that the denotative meanings were not grasped. Known words were used in an undifferentiated manner, indicating a paucity of functional vocabulary.

Dialect and idiolect. There was a variety of speech patterns in the responses as might be expected in oral language. But there was a recurring pattern that was general, and a few others quite unique among users of the English language. Both of these were counted in this subcategory.

Unconventional character identification. Some of the subjects seemed to avoid using proper names in favour of describing a character's role or behaviour. Others used proper names repeatedly and avoided using pronouns.

Inability to translate idiom. Unsuccessful attempts to cope with the idiomatic expressions used in the selections, comprised this subcategory.

When the categories had all been established, the responses were examined, and the kinds of factors noted in each.

Pronoun Errors

The indiscriminate use of the personal pronoun was the speech error most commonly found.

a. Gender

(1) Both the masculine and feminine forms were used in

relation to the same referent.

She was the one . . . and here he is.

(2) The wrong gender was used continually.

Aunt Beryl, he sounded . . .

(3) The genitive was frequently given the same gender as the noun it modified rather than that of the referent.

His husband; her wife.

Her mother; his son.

b. Number

(1) The plural form was used in relation to a singular referent.

they said, "I seen the little lamp."

told her that her father was in jail and they seemed happy when they were told that.

(2) The singular form was used in relation to a plural referent.

the woman and the baby, she had . . .

the Burnell children . . . to talk to her.

Lack of discrimination regarding the use of the personal pronoun would suggest that the function of the forms, to indicate the sex and number of the referent, was not realized.

Other Syntactical Errors

Lack of familiarity with the form of verbs and of function words was also apparent.

a. Verbs. Occasional errors were made in relation to verbs.

(1) Overuse of the present tense has already been remarked on.

she sees them seeing the doll house

(2) Lack of agreement with verb tenses was found occasionally.

something happened — they go . . . they stay

they were happy — they go

(3) Wrong form of the verb was found more often.

(a) when they growed up

(b) and didn't thought
and didn't came

(c) he shouldn't have went

All of the above are irregular verbs, but for those in groups (b) and (c) the effect of its auxiliary on the form of the verb does not appear to be functionally known.

(4) Lack of agreement between subject and verb was found only a few times.

they was going

they was happy

Errors of this kind were not found in the responses of many subjects, but those that made them did so a number of times.

b. Function words. There was a certain amount of confusion in the correct choice of prepositions and conjunctions.

(1) Until was confused with after.

"He was planning to leave until the woman gets strong."

The same mistake was made by four subjects while reporting that specific story detail. There would seem to be no precise knowledge of the function of "until." Alternatively the verb "to leave" might have been confused with its antonym "to stay."

(2) There were various substitutions for "by."

to thank him <u>for</u> giving him

frightened <u>of</u> what he did

(3) An attempt to use "either-or" was unsuccessful.

left by her husband who was <u>either</u> dead

instead of

<u>either</u> left by her husband <u>or</u> he was dead

(4) There was confusion in the use of "because."

because he didn't mind was —

instead of

the reason he didn't mind was —

Many more subjects were involved in errors caused by the wrong choice of function word than in those caused by confusion with verb tenses. Almost all of the subjects used a function word incorrectly at least once, but many made such errors repeatedly.

c. <u>Word order</u>. A change of word order, and hence of meaning, was identified in the responses of only two subjects, one of whom made three such errors.

<u>Even</u> the teacher was changed to the teacher was kind <u>even</u> when —

Alfred thought about <u>when</u> was changed to <u>when</u> Alfred

was going he thought —

Vocabulary Deficiencies

Evidence of a limited functional knowledge of English words was provided in a number of ways in the speech of the subjects.

a. Inappropriate adjectives. Occasionally, the words chosen to express ideas were incorrect as the examples below demonstrate.

"It makes me feel a little jealous of the Burnells because they are not nice."

"The Burnells' aunt was disappointed when she saw the Kelvey children."

The use of a few known adjectives was frequently inappropriate.

they were kind — they didn't fight

they're generous — they talk to everybody

they treated them pretty rough — the other people were selfish to them

The same few known adjectives—good, bad, nice, sad, happy—were scattered throughout the responses with no differentiation regarding their use. This would indicate an absence of knowledge of words with more exact shades of meaning.

b. Incorrect verbs. The greatest cause of error with regards to the choice of verbs, was the confusion between a correct verb and its antonym, or near-synonym. There was an apparent lack of knowledge of the exact meanings of the verbs used.

give was used instead of take

lend was used instead of give

asked for was used instead of offered

telling was used instead of saying

told was used instead of asked

said was used instead of asked

The verbs confused most frequently were those indicating some form of speech.

Dialect and Idiolect

There were sentence patterns which might almost be considered dialect, and others so unique they could be termed idiolect.

a. Dialect. The use of both the pronoun and its antecedent in the same structure was a persistent pattern. It would appear that the pronoun was used as an integral part of the verb phrase, the referent having been identified separately.

(1) The pronoun as the subject.

that little girl, she

those Kelveys, they

This pattern was found in the responses of at least two thirds of the subjects, in some cases occasionally, in others, repeatedly. The one below was found less frequently.

"He gave the Indian a chance—the deputy."

The referent in this case is placed after the verb phrase, not before it.

(2) The pronoun as the object. When the referent was the object of the verb, it was usually prefaced with "about" and placed before the verb.

"About the woman and the baby, I feel pity for them."

b. Idiolect. Sentence patterns such as the following were not found in many of the responses. They would seem to be unique to the individuals using them.

> "This part makes me feel—the woman and the baby, she had diphtheria—sorry for her."
>
> "And this Aunt Beryl—Kezia like—she was trying to b[illegible] this one girl . . ."
>
> "She was telling—her father—that he was in prison."
>
> "At first, Kezia, when she invited the Kelveys, they didn't want to go."

Generally, the first few words, and the last few words, together form the main idea of the sentence.

Unconventional Character Identification

Two kinds of character identification were found which might be considered unconventional.

a. Use of description. Description of the role or the behaviour of characters was the method used by a number of subjects to identify the fictional characters. Names were avoided.

Mr. Carr was referred to as:

> the storekeeper
>
> the man who owns the drugstore
>
> the owner of the drugstore
>
> the clerk
>
> this man, or that man.

Alfred was referred to as:

the boy

the one who works there

the boy who works in the drugstore

this boy.

Isabel, or Kezia, was referred to as:

the one that owns the doll house

the little girl who owns the doll house

this little Burnell girl

the oldest Burnell girl

the girl who asked her mum something.

Lil, or Else, was referred to as:

the oldest Kelvey

the youngest Kelvey

this little girl, that little girl

the one who always follows her sister

the one who hardly spoke

the one who never spoke.

Willis Darkcat was referred to generally as:

the Indian

the Blackfoot Indian.

Repetition of descriptive terms throughout the idea unit made it possible to avoid using pronouns.

b. Overuse of proper names. Pronouns were avoided by repeating proper names continually in single idea units.

"Sam Carr told Alfred Higgins to take those things out of his pockets. And

when Alfred Higgins took those things
out of his pocket, Sam Carr told Alfred
Higgins he was going to call the cops."

Inability to Translate Idiom

Part of any language is its idiom, but if the denotative meanings only of the separate words are known, translation becomes meaningless.

Idiom was used in each of the stories and three ways of coping with it were identified. The first was acceptance of the denotative meanings of the words; the second was an attempt to translate what was obviously unknown; while the third was avoidance of it altogether. In each case the total meaning of the section in which it was found, was changed.

a. Literal understanding. Efforts were made to give denotative meanings to the separate words in order to obtain a literal understanding of all, or part of the idiom.

(1) Not to speak of there being . . .

"I don't think it's good not to speak of
there being . . ."

"They were not supposed to speak."

(2) The line had to be drawn somewhere

"They were going to make a line . . ."

b. Translation or paraphrase. Translation was made of the part or parts which gave the idiom its particular meaning.

The first time he had ever looked upon his mother

These final words of Story 2 were variously translated.

the first time he had looked at his mother

the first time he had seen his mother

the first time he had noticed his mother

This expression of Callaghan's was recognized by only three subjects. It was ignored by sixteen. It was quoted exactly by seven, and "translated" by the remaining thirteen.

c. Avoidance. Idiom was ignored for the most part, and there was no way of being certain that such expressions had or had not been recognized. But responses were sometimes made, which could only have been made by avoiding the idiom in the passage.

(1) What a sell for Lena!

Either of two kinds of statement provided evidence that the idiom had been avoided because it had not been understood.

(a) the little girls laughed at Lil

(b) Lena was mad at the Kelveys

One or other of these kinds of remarks were made by eight subjects.

(2) . . . rushed away in a body.

Two people could hardly rush away "in a body." Yet it was reported that:

(a) they found a rope for them [the Kelveys] so they could play skipping

(b) the Kelveys were skipping and running

(c) it was time the Kelveys did this—like skipping and running.

Six subjects had the Kelveys playing at the end of section four of Story No. 1.

COMPARISON OF FACTORS IN LINGUISTIC CATEGORIES

There were 898 Linguistic factors which might have affected the accuracy of comprehension of the stories, or communication of the ideas obtained. The distribution of these factors may be seen in Table 37 on page 176. The numerical mean was 23; while individual scores ranged from the 7 of Subject 26 to the 78 of Subject 17.

The rank order of the categories placed Category 2 first with 227. Categories 1 and 4 were very close behind. Their totals were 221 and 217 respectively. The only other with a total of over 100 was Category 3 whose numerical count was 142. The scores of Categories 5 and 6 were 47 and 44 in that order.

The categories in the first two places were concerned with syntactical errors, and combined they accounted for more than half of the total for Linguistic factors. That placed third provided evidence of difficulties encountered in the manipulation of the syntactical and semantical components of the English language.

The category to which every subject contributed was Category 2. There were two with no number in Category 3, and four with none in Category 1. In each of the others there are more than ten subjects with no scores.

The highest individual count in any of the categories was the 46 of Subject 17 in Category 4. That number accounts for the high total of this subject. The responses contained overuse of the proper names—unnecessary repetition—to the degree that they were difficult to read, and very monotonous. Subject No. 1, however, rarely used a

Table 37

Individual and Group Numerical Scores of Factors in Linguistic Categories

Subject	Categories						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
No. 1	2	5	1	31	1	3	43
No. 2	1	1	7	3	2	1	15
No. 3	5	3	2	7	3	1	21
No. 4	1	2	4	5	2	--	14
No. 5	28	4	2	--	--	3	37
No. 6	5	4	1	1	1	1	13
No. 7	4	3	4	2	2	--	15
No. 8	11	1	12	5	1	--	30
No. 9	7	7	4	2	--	3	23
No. 10	28	7	5	2	6	3	51
No. 11	1	3	8	2	--	1	15
No. 12	3	5	5	--	--	1	14
No. 13	1	8	5	1	2	1	18
No. 14	11	5	9	24	--	--	49
No. 15	--	1	7	5	--	--	13
No. 16	2	7	1	4	1	--	15
No. 17	17	12	2	46	--	1	78
No. 18	--	14	4	--	--	--	18
No. 19	1	6	2	4	1	1	15
No. 20	8	2	1	--	1	1	13
No. 21	9	2	6	--	3	2	22
No. 22	3	6	5	1	3	1	19
No. 23	--	16	8	--	--	--	24
No. 24	6	8	5	--	--	1	20
No. 25	5	4	--	--	3	1	13
No. 26	3	2	1	--	1	--	7
No. 27	--	6	3	20	1	--	30
No. 28	11	2	2	1	3	1	20
No. 29	2	4	2	--	--	--	8
No. 30	6	4	5	--	2	2	19
No. 31	6	1	1	1	3	--	12
No. 32	2	7	--	3	3	4	19
No. 33	3	5	5	3	--	--	16
No. 34	3	2	4	1	--	--	10
No. 35	2	12	1	2	--	3	20
No. 36	1	13	1	--	1	1	17
No. 37	15	18	3	30	--	3	69
No. 38	4	7	1	10	--	2	24
No. 39	4	8	3	1	1	2	19
Total	221	227	142	217	47	44	898

1. Pronoun Errors
2. Other Syntactical Errors
3. Vocabulary Deficiencies
4. Dialect and Idiolect
5. Unconventional Character Identification
6. Inability to Translate Idiom

name, and attempted to identify the characters by means of description only. This technique was used also by Subjects 14 and 37. The scores of the last three subjects were 31, 24, and 30.

Other scores which were much higher than those of other subjects were the 28 of both Subjects 5 and 10 in Category 1. Both subjects used pronouns with little knowledge, if any, of their function.

Table 38

Ranges and Median Percentages of Factors in Linguistic Categories

	Categories					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Low	5	3	2	4	2	1
High	76	78	54	72	25	21
Median	40.5	40.5	28	38	13.5	11

The median percentages of Categories 1 and 2 were each 40.5. The range for the first was from 5% to 76%, the scores of Subjects 1 and 5. Percentages in the second category ranged from the 3 of Subject 8, to the 78 of Subject 18.

Categories 4 and 3 had the next highest medians of 38 and 28 respectively. Subject 10 had the 4% in the first of these categories, and Subject 1 had the 72%. The 2% in Category 3 was the score of Subject 1; and the 54%, that of Subject 15.

The order of the median percentages of the remaining two categories was Category 5 fifth with 13.5, and Category 6 last with 11. The 2% in Category 5 was once again the score of Subject 1; the 25%

that of Subject 31. In Category 6, Subject 17 had the 1%, and Subject 32, the 21%.

The similarity of the group results in Categories 1, 2, and 4 has already been mentioned, as well as their interdependence. Although Category 6 had a low median percentage it was not due to comparative success in translating idiom. It was due rather to the small number of responses related to these expressions.

Percentages of individual subjects may be seen in Table 39 on page 179. Two subjects, 18 and 23, had percentages in only two categories, but there were ten with percentages in them all. These ten it may be assumed, were having difficulties in all areas of linguistic behaviour. But it may not be assumed that the other subjects were not—only that evidence of such had not been provided.

There were twelve whose greatest difficulty was in Category 1, two of whom had a similar score in another category. Fifteen had their greatest difficulty in Category 2, three with the same score in another category. In Category 3, the greatest difficulty was found by eight, three having the same score in another category. Those who found more difficulties in Category 4 also numbered eight, while no one had the highest percentage of Factors in either Category 5 or Category 6.

The greatest difficulties of twenty-seven subjects seemed to be in one area—that of the syntax of the English language. However, every subject faced linguistic difficulties in varying degrees. There were, nevertheless, many differences in the individual patterns, and the result of analysis of the Experiential factors would seem to

Table 39

Individual Percentages of Factors in Linguistic Categories

Subject	Categories					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
No. 1	5	12	2	72	2	7
No. 2	7	7	46	20	13	7
No. 3	24	14	10	33	14	5
No. 4	7	14	29	36	14	--
No. 5	76	11	5	--	--	8
No. 6	38	30	8	8	8	8
No. 7	27	20	27	13	13	--
No. 8	37	3	40	17	3	--
No. 9	30	30	17	9	--	14
No. 10	55	14	10	4	11	6
No. 11	7	20	53	13	--	7
No. 12	21	36	36	--	--	7
No. 13	6	44	27	6	11	6
No. 14	22	10	18	50	--	--
No. 15	--	8	54	38	--	--
No. 16	13	47	7	26	7	--
No. 17	22	15	3	59	--	1
No. 18	--	78	22	--	--	--
No. 19	7	40	13	26	7	7
No. 20	61	15	8	--	8	8
No. 21	41	9	27	--	14	9
No. 22	16	32	26	5	16	5
No. 23	--	67	33	--	--	--
No. 24	30	40	25	--	--	5
No. 25	38	31	--	--	23	8
No. 26	43	29	14	--	14	--
No. 27	--	20	10	67	3	--
No. 28	55	10	10	5	15	5
No. 29	25	50	25	--	--	--
No. 30	32	21	26	--	10.5	10.5
No. 31	50	8.3	8.3	8.3	25	--
No. 32	10	37	--	16	16	21
No. 33	19	31	31	19	--	--
No. 34	30	20	40	10	--	--
No. 35	10	60	5	10	--	15
No. 36	6	76	6	--	6	6
No. 37	22	26	4	44	--	4
No. 38	17	29	4	42	--	8
No. 39	21	42	16	5	5	11

1. Pronoun Errors
2. Other Syntactical Errors
3. Vocabulary Deficiencies
4. Dialect and Idiolect
5. Unconventional Character Identification
6. Inability to Translate Idiom

have been paralleled in the analysis of those in the Linguistic categories.

ESTABLISHING READING CATEGORIES

There was evidence in many of the responses of an insufficient knowledge of the written language code, and lack of experience with it. Some specific limitations were identified, and categories established.

Non-reading. An over-simplified definition of successful reading might be the ability to recognize and understand ideas presented through the medium of a written language, according to the determiners of meaning used by the author. The exact quotation of words or phrases placed in a meaningless relationship with each other is not reading. Recognition of isolated words and grouping them in a meaningful relationship is not reading. Nor is the use of recognized words in contexts unrelated to the texts of the stories, reading. Because these techniques were considered important factors inhibiting accurate comprehension of the written material, they were classified as "non-reading."

Word recognition. Evidence of failure in word recognition was rare, but instances were identified. There was evidence of recognition of part only of the whole verbal symbol, and of subsequent additions, or other modifications which changed its meaning.

Author's techniques. Limitations were apparent in grasping connotative meanings of words or phrases, or of those used as figures of speech. Other stylistic techniques used by the authors were not

recognized.

Disregard of punctuation. The content of some responses indicated that the punctuation symbols, second in importance to the verbal symbols, were being ignored, or changed. Commas were regarded as end punctuation; periods and question marks were not seen; and reports of direct speech were frequently inaccurate, or incorrect.

Complex sentence structure. Partly as a result of failing to recognize punctuation symbols, and partly through lack of familiarity with noun and adverbial clauses, complex sentence structures proved to be impossible to unravel. Compound subjects, and compound genitives presented further difficulties.

Projection of oral language. If justification were needed for drawing attention to unconventional speech habits it was because there was evidence that those habits were projected into the reading material. Some subjects would seem to have obtained ideas through "reading" the texts according to their own "dialect."

Inability to identify referents. Inability to identify the referent because of confusion regarding the gender of the pronoun was considered to be a Linguistic factor. Inability to identify the referent when the reason was not apparent, was the factor classified here.

Examples have been provided of each of the categories described briefly above.

Non-reading

Partial reading of the content of the stories might have been the result of the design of the study to some extent. The subjects were required to respond orally to sections of the stories read silently outside the interview area. They attempted to grasp some of the ideas in order to have something to talk about. This encouraged all but the fluent readers to indulge in partial reading, or "skimming." In addition, although each subject kept his copy of the story, and could have referred to it, memory was involved as well as comprehension.

Avoidance of key words. Incorrect visual reconstruction of the story was frequently the result of avoiding single words or groups of words. Those avoided have been underlined.

(1) and she just gave a silly, shamefaced smile

Lil's smile was described in various ways.

a simple smile a silly smile a shameful smile

a little smile a silly little smile

she smiled or she just smiled

Other words had to be avoided to fit the description understood.

(2) and she didn't seem to mind the question

Seven subjects who had described Lil's smile inaccurately also described her feelings wrongly, saying that she didn't mind. So did four others who had not mentioned the smile.

Reports such as the above giving evidence of inaccurate

reconstruction, through avoiding key words or phrases, were found in the responses to all three stories.

Selection of parts. Details projected into the stories were often the result of recognizing isolated words or phrases, which were then placed in a "logical" relationship with each other.

(1) she gazed at him . . . stop and help us

This was understood to mean that the Indian wanted to leave, but the woman did not want him to. In fact, she was thanking him, and said it was good of him to "stop and help us." The complete sentence could not have been read.

(2) he could still hear Sam Carr . . . he could hear her talking simply and earnestly

The following response may be seen to have resulted from reading parts only of the paragraph containing the quotation.

"Mrs. Higgins . . . he was talking to herself . . ."

Three other subjects had Mrs. Higgins talking to herself in the kitchen.

(3) Parts of two paragraphs are quoted below.

Paragraph 1: her hand trembled

Paragraph 2: Alfred . . . this trembling

Both of the quotations would seem to have contributed to the following statement:

". . . his mother's shaking, and so is Alfred."

The kinds of "skimming" demonstrated were found in the responses of all but four of the subjects at least once. In a number of cases partial reading was evident in a few responses, but for two subjects

it was identified in many.

Word Recognition

The ability to recognize and articulate the written verbal symbols is not reading, but the inability to so do prevents accurate comprehension of what is read. Evidence of this failure was found in a number of reactions.

Initial part recognized. The following errors were made by a total of eight subjects.

genial	was read as	gentle
once	was read as	one
rather	was read as	rarely
aware	was read as	awed
there	was read as	they

The first error was made by three subjects, the second by two, and the last three were each made by one subject only.

compacts was reported as chocolate

This may have been substitution of a word beginning with "c" for the one forgotten, rather than failure in word recognition.

Outstanding parts recognized.

fumes	was read as	from
dreadful	was read as	dead

Two subjects were involved in this kind of partial recognition, one of them adopting a negative attitude because of the last error.

Digraphs were confused. Four subjects were involved in the

following two errors.

hoarse	was read as	harsh
house	was read as	horse

One subject only made the first error, but three made the last. One of these continued until the end of the story, to hold expectations aroused by the mistake. When the word "horse" was used in the story, it was not recognized.

Suffixes avoided or changed. The text described Mr. Carr as speaking in "a quiet manner." Five subjects described him as "a quiet man." In addition, each of the following errors was made by a different subject.

breathing	was read as	breaths
strangeness	was read as	strange

There were changes, too, from nouns to verbs.

sufferers	was changed to	suffered
wonderment	was changed to	wondered

Those two errors were both made once, and by the same subject.

mean	was recognized in	meaningful

Six subjects described various characters as "mean" after reading the section using the word "meaningful." Four of them used the word in two or three different reactions.

Part of a compound word recognized. The first two of the following errors were made once by two different subjects.

courtyard	was changed to	court house
washerwoman	was changed to	dishwasher

shamefaced was changed to shameful

The last one was made by two subjects, once each.

Author's Techniques

Literal connotations were read into the stories because of failure to recognize the stylistic techniques used by the authors.

Author's intention. In spite of direction from the author, Mansfield's intended meanings were frequently not grasped.

> Even the teacher had a special voice for them, and a special smile for the other children . . .

The word "special" was understood literally, and the Kelveys were regarded as the teacher's "pets" by five subjects. One other remarked that the teacher must be "kind." Similarly, connotations different from those intended by the author were given to the following underlined words by eight subjects.

the carpet made a great sensation	=	feeling
gave a little squeal and danced in front of the other girls	=	performed
had never heard his employer speak softly	=	speak nicely
his youth seemed to be over	=	he was older than he thought he was

Point of view not recognized. Because it was not recognized from whose point of view statements or comments in the stories had been made, the latter were often regarded as facts presented by the author.

(1) Exaggeration of the children's point of view, was not recognized by six subjects, in the following quotation.

they had never seen anything like it

There were various interpretations.

the Burnells must be poor people

they never go to town to see the things they want

they're not allowed see other people's things

Unusual interpretations were given to the following quotation, as if it were a literal fact.

(2) never did they skip so high, run in and out so fast

the children were not very healthy

they never did so much exercise before

they needed to do "them things" because they'd never done them before.

(3) Failure to recognize remarks made from Aunt Beryl's point of view resulted in statements concerning the smell of paint, and in the author being criticized for calling the Kelveys, "those little rats."

(4) Nine subjects reported that the Indian would be accused of stealing a white man's horse if he were caught with one. That idea was the Indian's, not the author's.

Simile not recognized. The function of "like" or "as," to introduce comparison, was not recognized by some subjects.

(1) like two little stray cats was understood as referring to cats.

(2) the Indian would feel like a prisoner was understood as meaning he had been in prison.

Only one subject made the error concerning the cats, but there

was general confusion with regards to the "prisoner" and his "prison."

Flashback not recognized. Failure to recognize the use of this technique had a very disconcerting effect on a number of subjects.

(1) The unusual introduction was not recognized.

> Out on the porch he looked back the way he had come. Ten days and one man's life back he had left the reservation.

The result of not recognizing the introduction was chaotic for four subjects, whose reconstruction of Story No. 3 was similar to the following.

> ". . . and he went back on the porch. And he went back to the reservation, and was talking to the chief and the Indian agent . . . And the chief gave this man a horse, and he rode back where the lady was staying . . ."

(2) The verb tenses were not recognized.

(a) The verbs "he recalled," "he wondered," "he wondered if" were used continually in Story No. 3 to indicate what was being remembered. In addition the verb tenses were an indication of the change in the time of the incidents reported. In view of the repeated use of the present tense by a number of subjects, the use of the past and the past perfect tenses as directives for the reader, was probably not noticed.

> ". . . this guy here, he's getting drunk, and he's getting into fights . . ."

(b) The verb tenses were not recognized as important in Story No. 1 or Story No. 2.

(i) The afternoon had been awful. A letter

had come from Willie Brent . . . But
now that she had frightened . . .

The sequence of the incidents in the above quotation from the story was understood in the order in which they were narrated. Four subjects reported that Aunt Beryl sent the children away, scolded Kezia, and then read Willie's letter.

(ii) He understood why she had sat alone in the kitchen the night his young sister had kept repeating . . . that she was getting married.

Two subjects presented the details as both taking place at the same time.

"Alfred saw his mother . . . and remembered that his sister was getting married."

Disregard of Punctuation

Punctuation symbols are as much part of the structure of the written language as are the verbal symbols and word order. There was evidence in the responses, of failure to recognize their function.

End punctuation. The verb was frequently taken to be the end of an idea, and whatever followed it was avoided. The idea, therefore, was incomplete or inaccurate.

(1) Mr. Carr was embarrassed by her lack of terror and simplicity.

The whole quotation beyond "embarrassed" was avoided by a few subjects who gave various reasons, all of them wrong, for the embarrassment of Mr. Carr. Others did attempt to interpret "lack of terror" which was taken to mean "anger" rather than "fear." The end of the sentence was verbalized by no one.

(2) . . . the teacher had . . . a special smile for the other children.

At least ten subjects reported that the teacher had both a special voice and a special smile for the Kelvey children.

(3) The meanings of verbs were sometimes changed by avoiding part of the complete verb phrase, and making the verb intransitive.

(a) . . . including the Burnells, were not allowed even to speak to them

The Burnells were thus not speaking at all.

(b) Isobel and Lottie . . . went upstairs to change their pinafores.

The children here were expected to be "more considerate," when they came downstairs again.

In the example given last, it is possible that "pinafores" was avoided because its meaning was unknown. Even so, the idea was considered to have been complete at the verb, and absence of end punctuation showing that it was not, was disregarded.

Failure to recognize ellipses. Two factors preventing accurate comprehension were the outcome of failing to recognize ellipses. The first was that the break in the time sequence indicated by the symbol itself was not understood. As a result, the elliptical statement, or question, was incorrectly inferred.

(1) Time element:

. . . our Else holding on to Lil, listened too, while they chewed their jam sandwiches out of a newspaper soaked with large red blobs . . .

"Mother," said Kezia, "can't I ask the Kelveys just once?"

The time element was confused and Kezia was understood to have asked her mother during the lunch hour.

> "When the girls were sitting under the pine trees eating their lunch, Kezia asked her mum . . ."

The same situation was understood by five others, and was probably the reason for a remark passed by another subject while responding to section 5.

> "I thought the doll house was closer to the school."

(2) Implied question. As well as not recognizing the function of the punctuation symbol, a few subjects wrongly completed the elliptical question, or avoided it.

Kezia was reported to have asked her mother:

(a) if she could let the Kelvey girls to join a dinner.

(b) if she could ask Lil if it's true Mr. Kelvey is in prison

(c) something

Failure to recognize the nature of the question—clearly implied in the sentence following Mrs. Burnell's answer—may have been the result of inability to recognize the antecedent of the pronoun.

> At last everybody had seen it.

The "doll's house" was mentioned only at the beginning of the section, for the remainder of which it was referred to by means of the pronoun only.

Quotation marks. There was evidence that the use of quotation marks indicated the exact words spoken, but there was difficulty recognizing the limit of these words.

"I don't want to be harsh," Mr. Carr was saying.

There would seem to be no way that the speaker in the quotation above could have been confused. But he was.

"I don't think she was getting harsh to Mr. Carr . . ."

Confusion in the reports of direct speech was found in responses to each of the stories. Functional knowledge of the use of quotation marks to indicate the limits of the words spoken was, apparently, insufficiently grasped.

Complex Sentence Structure

Inability to unravel complex sentence structures was demonstrated in the verbalized reactions, and various devices were used to obtain some understanding. Because of the complexity of some of the structures used, passages from Mansfield's story are given as examples.

Beginnings and endings joined. The following passages evoked some remarkable reactions.

(1) They were the daughters of the spry, hardworking little washerwoman who went from house to house by day.

Parts of the sentence, which have been underlined, would seem to have been joined together by five subjects. Two of them described the Kelvey children as hard working little girls "who went cleaning in houses for other women." Three others thought that one of the reasons they were treated badly by the other girls was jealousy that the Kelveys "do most of the work." The personal culture of the subjects, as well as difficulty understanding complex structure, was responsible for such confusion.

(2) The father and mother dolls, who sprawled very stiff as though they had fainted in the drawing room, and their two little children asleep upstairs were really too big for the doll's house. They didn't look as though they belonged.

The subject and verb of a simple sentence—or the beginning and end of the complex one—would seem to have been all that was recognized to evoke such responses as the following.

"There was a father and mother doll, but they were too big for the doll house."

Other devices, however, were also used to obtain meaning from the difficult sentence structure in quotation (2) above.

Part separated as complete. The next response would seem to refer to the end of the long sentence, and to the short one following it.

"The children didn't really look on the doll house—they were too old for it . . ."

Failure to recognize the compound subject of the main verb would appear to have been responsible for this and the previous reaction. The conjunction joining the two subjects—parent dolls and their children—seems to have been understood as introducing a new idea. This means that the comma was regarded as end punctuation.

The personal culture understood "too big" as "too old." But the children who were "too old" must have been the Burnell children. Evidence that the sleeping children were thought to be the Burnell children was provided in the responses of seven other subjects who gave the number of girls as two, although at this point in the story the number was not known.

". . . the story's about these two little Burnell girls . . ."

"This part's telling about the two sisters . . ."

Even after the number could have been identified as three, one subject continued to refer to two, even using names. She spoke about Isabel and Kezia, Isabel and Lottie, or Kezia and Lottie, but she never had the three together at any one time. Such confusion could not have resulted had there been familiarity with the sentence structure used by Mansfield. The "father and mother dolls" is already a compound subject, and it was separated from "their little children" (which must have been read as "the little children"), by a relative clause. Nevertheless, they were all too big for the doll's house, and that fact was verbalized by no one.

In addition to the eight responses which gave evidence of confusion between the doll children and the Burnell children, there was a number giving evidence of faulty reconstruction of the doll's house. By looking at them collectively, the problem would seem to have been the result of reconstructing it as big enough to have the Burnell children "asleep upstairs."

"Those little girls are lucky to get a doll house so big that they can take their friends in and show them around."

One subject referred to the doll's house as a "playhouse"; and phrases such as "take them into the doll house," "went into the doll house," "saw them in there," "sending them out of the doll house," were included in the responses of eleven.

This rather long discussion may appear to be far removed from

the complex sentence which evoked it. But it would seem that faulty reconstruction was recurring through the remainder of the story for at least twenty-one subjects, as a result of failing to understand that one sentence. The examples demonstrate the difficulty experienced by the subjects when faced with structures more complex than a simple sentence, or one containing a single relative clause.

Projection of Oral Language

This category was established after many futile attempts had been made to find the error in certain seemingly incomprehensible responses. Only after projecting the speech patterns of the subjects into the reading material did that technique become evident.

Projection of dialect. The example given first is one that was impossible to understand for a very long time, and was solved only after projecting into Mansfield's story, one of the patterns of the dialect discussed earlier.

(1) Many of the children, including the Burnells, were not allowed to speak to them. They walked past the Kelveys with their heads in the air . . .

The agent in the part underlined was misunderstood, in the following response.

"I feel sorry for the Kelvey children the way they stick their heads in the air . . ."

The habitual speech pattern, using both the referent and the pronoun in the same structure—as in (a) and (b) below—would seem to have been projected into the underlined part of (1) above. The result was a "reading" as in (c) below.

(a) She was brave—Lil Kelvey . . .

(b) They shook hands—Mrs. Higgins and Mr. Carr . . .

(c) They walked past—the Kelveys . . .

It may be noticed, that in order to project such patterns into the text, the comma as a symbol to indicate pauses, becomes disfunctional. In the same way, by giving a certain flexibility to the function of quotation marks, oral language could be projected into an incident containing direct speech. Such projection, in fact, was found to be responsible for a number of inaccurate reports.

(2) "Good night, Mrs. Higgins. I'm truly sorry," he said.

The quotation marks were apparently understood as an indication that someone was speaking, but not necessarily of exactly what was said.

". . . and Mrs. Higgins was telling him how sorry he was because of Alfred."

The form of the pronoun to indicate the sex of the speaker was obviously not recognized either in the reading material or in the oral response. And the fact that everything between the two sets of quotation marks was spoken by the same person would seem to have been ignored. What the subject had apparently read into the quotation from the text, was:

"Good night. I'm truly sorry," Mrs. Higgins, he said.

Both the antecedent and the pronoun were expected to be in the same structure, and passages were read as if this was so. This factor explained the inaccurate reconstruction of eight subjects, and the

incorrect report of direct speech in the responses of seventeen.

Indiscriminate use of the pronoun. Another linguistic habit of the subjects, which was projected into the reading of the stories, was lack of discrimination in the form of the personal pronoun to indicate the sex of its referent. Both Projection of dialect and Indiscriminate use of the pronoun are demonstrated in the last response quoted above. The same confusion was projected into the title of Callaghan's story. It was not realized that the pronoun in the title must refer to a female. It was even thought by a few that Callaghan had made a mistake in his choice of pronoun.

> "This title should be wrong, because it's talking about a boy."

Because Alfred was mentioned early in the story, it seemed that he might prove to be a victim of circumstances. He was thought to be the protagonist, the one whose life was made wretched by parents who did not care about him, and by employers who were always "mean." While it is more than likely that such reactions resulted from not having recognized that the title referred to a woman, they do not contain evidence of the projection of oral language. There were others, however, that bore a direct relationship with the title, and were seen to be the result of the oral language factor.

> "Sam Carr is always looking into this boy's pockets."
>
> "This boy did steal all her life."
>
> "He realized that all the years of his life . . ."

Remarks such as the above were made by eleven subjects, some of them more than once. They explained the negative attitudes

adopted, at the beginning of the story, towards both Mr. Carr and Mrs. Higgins.

Inability to Identify Referents

Where it had been possible to do so, the cause of confused reporting was sought and frequently found. There was a large number of such reports containing inaccurate identification of characters, for which no reason could be found except apparent guessing. A pronoun had been used in the text, and the referent had been wrongly identified by the subject. The confusion was not one of failing to recognize the gender as indicating the sex of the referent, however.

> . . . the oldest Kelvey said she saw the little lamp.
>
> Isabel said, "It's true, it's true."
>
> Lil smiled (at the end).
>
> Alfred was trying to call the cops.
>
> Alfred was sorry.

A number of errors such as these, followed the use of a pronoun in the story, for which the antecedent was not in, or near, the same structure. The difficulty facing the subjects in trying to locate the referents cannot be explained by the investigator with certainty. It would appear that the forms of the English pronoun were regarded as being interchangeable—or genderless—as they are in the Indian languages. In which case the reader would have been left with no linguistic clue to assist in the identification of referents. He would need to depend solely on some kind of logic.

COMPARISON OF FACTORS IN READING CATEGORIES

The numerical count of factors in the seven Reading categories may be seen in Table 40 on page 200. The total was 612, and the mean, therefore, was 15.7. The highest individual total was 61, the score of Subject 21, but only three others had 30 or more. The lowest was the 3 of Subject 27, while fourteen others had 10 or less.

Category 1 had the highest score, of 237. This might have been expected, since the first category included various kinds of non-reading techniques—avoidance, selection, or skimming. Categories 3 and 6 had similar totals of 86, which placed them both in the second place. The rank order of the remaining categories placed Category 4 next with 71, followed by Category 5 with a total of 54. The last two were Categories 7 and 2; the former had 42, and the latter, 36.

The most noticeable score in any single category is that of Subject 21 in Category 1. The tremendous effort made by this subject to tell all he could about the stories may, perhaps, be appreciated. It resulted, however, in the total of 40 Non-reading errors, most of which contained recognition of words and phrases only. Incidents were reported which would seem to have been created around such recognition. The second highest score in the first category was that of Subject 38. Partial recognition and exact quotations helped towards the final score of 29.

Twenty-five subjects—that is two thirds of the subject sample—projected their oral language habits into their reading at least once. But the whole thirty-nine did with regards to the "doll's house,"

Table 40

Individual and Group Numerical Scores of Factors in Reading Categories

Subject	Categories							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
No. 1	1	--	--	--	3	3	--	7
No. 2	5	2	8	2	2	9	2	30
No. 3	6	--	2	1	1	1	1	12
No. 4	3	--	2	--	--	1	--	6
No. 5	4	2	3	--	1	2	3	15
No. 6	8	--	1	1	--	2	6	18
No. 7	4	--	2	--	3	--	--	9
No. 8	5	--	3	--	--	2	2	12
No. 9	2	1	1	6	3	4	2	19
No. 10	8	--	7	6	4	2	6	33
No. 11	9	2	4	--	3	7	1	26
No. 12	5	1	--	4	2	5	--	17
No. 13	--	3	2	3	--	2	--	10
No. 14	2	--	--	3	1	1	--	7
No. 15	3	1	1	1	--	--	2	8
No. 16	7	1	1	2	--	--	--	11
No. 17	5	--	2	2	2	1	--	12
No. 18	5	--	5	1	--	1	1	13
No. 19	3	--	3	--	3	--	--	9
No. 20	6	--	2	1	3	--	1	13
No. 21	40	4	6	4	2	1	4	61
No. 22	7	--	1	1	--	5	--	14
No. 23	7	1	3	--	2	--	--	13
No. 24	4	2	2	2	3	4	--	17
No. 25	6	3	1	--	--	8	--	18
No. 26	4	2	2	--	2	--	--	10
No. 27	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	3
No. 28	1	1	2	--	1	5	--	10
No. 29	1	1	--	2	--	--	--	4
No. 30	6	2	6	6	3	--	3	26
No. 31	5	--	--	--	--	--	--	5
No. 32	3	1	--	4	--	2	--	10
No. 33	2	1	3	2	3	1	--	12
No. 34	2	1	--	--	1	--	--	4
No. 35	5	--	1	4	2	8	3	23
No. 36	2	1	5	2	2	5	--	17
No. 37	6	2	--	4	--	--	--	12
No. 38	29	--	--	7	--	4	3	43
No. 39	13	1	5	--	2	--	2	23
Total	237	36	86	71	54	86	42	612

1. Non-reading
2. Word Recognition
3. Author's Techniques
4. Disregard of Punctuation
5. Complex Sentence Structure
6. Projection of Oral Language
7. Inability to Identify Referents

every time it was mentioned. The projection, in this case, was not counted, since the numbers involved would have given to Category 6, an importance out of proportion to what, in fact, was so.

Table 41

Ranges and Median Percentages of Factors in Reading Categories

	Categories						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Low	10	4	4	6	3	2	3
High	100	30	38	50	43	50	33
Median	55	17	21	28	23	26	18

The detail noticed first in Table 41 is the percentage of 100 in Category 1, which brought the median for that category to the high 55, and to the first rank. The range was from 10%-100%.

The ranges of the percentages in Categories 4 and 6 were from 6 to 50, and from 2 to 50. Their medians, therefore, of 28% and 26% respectively, were in the second and third ranks. They were followed by Categories 5 and 3 with medians of 23% and 21%. The range of the former was from 3% to 43%, and of the latter from 4% to 38%. The last two were Categories 7 and 2, with ranges of from 3% to 33% in the first case, and from 4% to 30% in the second. That meant the median percentages were 18 and 17 respectively.

The predominance of the technique of Non-reading—indicated in Table 40 on page 200—was reinforced in Table 41 above. The median percentage in Category 1 was approximately twice as high as the one

in the second place. Four categories had median percentages of between 21 and 28, and there was only a 1% difference between the medians of the last two.

These differences reflect the variety of individual percentages seen in Table 42 on page 203. Two subjects it will be noticed, had percentages of 100 in Category 1. They were Subjects 27 and 31. Subject 13, however, had nothing in this category. Six subjects had percentages in Category 1, above the median of 55. Another sixteen had their highest percentages in this category. Four others had a similar high percentage in this and in another. That made a total of twenty-six subjects who either read in an apparently haphazard manner, or were unable to translate recognized words into expressions of their own.

Subject 13 was the only one with the highest percentage in Category 2, but the same percentage was also in Category 4. That would suggest that Subject 13 found equal difficulty in understanding the punctuation symbols as with accurate word recognition. All of the five subjects with their highest percentage in Category 3 had a similar percentage in at least one other category.

Punctuation proved to be the greatest source of difficulty for Subjects 9, 14, 29, and 32, whose highest percentage was in Category 4. Subjects 13 and 30 had their highest shared with this and at least one other category.

The highest percentages of Subjects 1, 19, and 33 were found in Category 5, but each was also placed in other categories. This was not the case, however, with Category 6. Of the eight subjects

Table 42

Individual Percentages of Factors in Reading Categories

Subject	Categories						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No. 1	14	--	--	--	43	43	--
No. 2	18	6	28	6	6	30	6
No. 3	50	--	18	8	8	8	8
No. 4	50	--	33	--	--	17	--
No. 5	27	13	20	--	7	13	20
No. 6	44	--	6	6	--	11	33
No. 7	45	--	22	--	33	--	--
No. 8	41	--	25	--	--	17	17
No. 9	11	5	5	32	16	21	10
No. 10	25	--	21	18	12	6	18
No. 11	35	8	15	--	12	27	3
No. 12	29	6	--	24	12	29	--
No. 13	--	30	20	30	--	20	--
No. 14	29	--	--	43	14	14	--
No. 15	37.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	--	--	25
No. 16	64	9	9	18	--	--	--
No. 17	41	--	17	17	17	8	--
No. 18	38	--	38	8	--	8	8
No. 19	33.3	--	33.3	--	33.3	--	--
No. 20	46	--	15	8	23	--	8

Subject	Categories						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No. 21	65	7	9	7	3	2	7
No. 22	50	--	7	7	--	36	--
No. 23	54	8	23	--	15	--	--
No. 24	23	12	12	12	17	24	--
No. 25	33	17	6	--	--	44	--
No. 26	40	20	20	--	20	--	--
No. 27	100	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 28	10	10	20	--	10	50	--
No. 29	25	25	--	50	--	--	--
No. 30	23	7	23	23	12	--	12
No. 31	100	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 32	30	10	--	40	--	20	--
No. 33	17	8	25	17	25	8	--
No. 34	50	25	--	--	25	--	--
No. 35	22	--	4	17	9	35	13
No. 36	12	6	29	12	12	29	--
No. 37	50	17	--	33	--	--	--
No. 38	68	--	--	16	--	10	6
No. 39	56	4	22	--	9	--	9

1. Non-reading
2. Word Recognition
3. Author's Techniques
4. Disregard of Punctuation
5. Complex Sentence Structure
6. Projection of Oral Language
7. Inability to Identify Referents

with their highest percentages here only those of Subjects 1, 12, and 36, were shared with another group.

Table 42 shows quite clearly that the most inhibiting Reading factor with regards to comprehension of the reading material was the method, or process itself, of reading. In the absence, it would seem, of the skills and abilities required, the subjects attempted to obtain ideas through various methods of "non-reading." Other interrelated factors seemed to have more or less affect on accurate comprehension. They were seldom found, however, to have had a similar affect on different subjects.

SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

This chapter was concerned with the comparison of factors which appeared to be preventing accurate comprehension of the literary selections. The factors were identified as Experiential, Linguistic, or Reading. The relative frequency of each kind was then compared and discussed.

For the three groups separately, categories of specific factors were formulated, and the number in each counted. This was followed by examination of the categories, and discussion in terms of their numerical count and percentages.

Chapter 6

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A brief summary of the study and a discussion of the findings are presented in this chapter. Conclusions have been drawn from the results, and practical implications of these conclusions have been considered, with particular reference to the educational needs of Indian children. Finally, further related research has been suggested.

SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

Initially the purpose of this study was to explore the verbalized responses of a group of Cree subjects to three literary selections. Squire's classifications of response to literature were used to compare the nature of the tape-recorded reactions. Division of the responses into these classifications revealed many that were deviant. The purpose of the study was then extended to include exploration of the degree of accurate comprehension of the selections. Analysis of the results led to the formulation of categories of factors which apparently had affected accurate comprehension, and to further analysis and comparison.

The theoretical background of the study was provided by a survey of the opinions of experts on the nature of language, and the nature of literature. Related research was reviewed for methods of exploring and measuring response to literature, and the findings of the studies were also examined. From these readings, the design of the present study evolved.

The subject sample was chosen according to age and grade level. Three stories were selected on the basis of literary quality only, and were divided into segments for silent reading. The subjects verbalized freely their reactions to each section, and the ideas obtained from it. Five students registered in the Intercultural Program at the University of Alberta were volunteer interviewers.

The verbalized reactions were transcribed, divided into recording units, and placed in the classifications devised by Squire. As a result of discovering a large number of deviant reactions, approximately 30 content units were selected at random and examined. Categories of Acceptable, Miscellaneous, and Deviant responses were formed, and the total data separated into their respective groups. Similar kinds of responses within each division were placed into subcategories for further analysis and comparison.

Inspection of those reactions which failed to give evidence of successful comprehension revealed factors which had apparently affected comprehension. They were Experiential, Linguistic and Reading factors. More specific subcategories were established within these main groups, and analysis was undertaken to determine the relative occurrence of each factor.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The questions posed in Chapter 1 are answered in this section of the chapter, in the light of the findings. Discussion of the findings, and generalizations, follow the answers to each question.

Question 1. What evidence has been provided of successful comprehension of the literary selections?

Evidence of successful comprehension was provided in the 1608 Acceptable responses, and in the median percentage of 53 for this kind of response. The lowest individual score was 28%, and the highest was 78%.

There were at least five different ways that successful comprehension was apparent.

1. Accurate reconstruction. Recognition of the main ideas and details of the stories was demonstrated in the responses. In addition, the skills and abilities required for such recognition were identified.
   a. Accurate translation of key words and phrases provided evidence that certain ideas had been understood.
   b. Figurative language was successfully translated in some cases.
   c. The correct translation of English idiom, though rare, was to be found in a few responses as evidence of comprehension.
   d. A collection of details, or single details were successfully presented in paraphrase and occasionally fused into a single idea.
   e. Recognition of the point of view of inferences or generalizations was also apparent.
   f. Some responses demonstrated the ability to distinguish between factual information given by the author, and the opinion of the characters.
   g. Previously misunderstood details were corrected as a result of accurate comprehension of later facts.

2. Recognizing experiences. Since the stories were sectioned for reading and responding, details recognized were those contained in the section concerned. Nevertheless, a number was recognized.
   a. The setting of the story was correctly established from recognition of the experience of the character.
   b. The report of a character's actions frequently indicated familiarity with the particular behaviour pattern.
   c. Feelings and emotions of the characters were correctly inferred from recognition of the significance of their appearance or behaviour.
3. Understanding characters. Valid inferences regarding the personality of the characters were made frequently.
   a. The nature of a character was understood through accurate observation of behaviour.
   b. Recognition of the significance of further evidence was responsible for a change in the first impressions of a character.
4. Recognizing relationships. Causal relationships between a character and his actions were correctly established.
   a. The intentions, or motivations of the characters were identified.
   b. The reason, or cause of behaviour was correctly understood.
   c. The result, or effect was recognized.
5. Appropriate reactions. Accurate interpretation of the experiences resulted in reactions which might be considered appropriate.
   a. There were appraisals of recognized behaviour in terms of generally-accepted human values.
   b. Critical comments were made concerning observed behaviour,

which indicated that implied moral or ethical human obligations had been grasped.

c. Imaginative involvement resulted in a deeper understanding of the experiences of the characters.

d. Empathic reactions were expressed for the characters.

e. The tone of a passage was recognized and responded to accordingly.

The median percentage of responses concerned with Accurate Reconstruction was 46.5. The responses were mainly paraphrastic, giving evidence of sufficient linguistic knowledge to recognize some of the ideas presented in the story. This was the predominant kind of response made to Story No. 3. Familiarity with some of the words and techniques used by the authors was apparent, and skills and abilities revealed, such as had been referred to by Harris (1948).

Recognizing Experiences of the characters through observation of details had a median percentage of 22.5. There was evidence of the use of previous knowledge and personal experience, as reported by Forman (1951), to obtain meaning from the selections. Familiarity with certain patterns of behaviour, and with the psychological or emotional experiences associated with them, was also indicated. There was evidence of sensitivity, and of intuition on the part of the subjects, which assisted recognition of the feelings of the characters. In addition, the significance of descriptive details supplied by the author to indicate a character's thoughts or emotions was sometimes perceived.

Understanding Characters—their nature and predispositions—

had a median percentage of 17. It seemed important to be in sympathy with, and to give one's loyalty to, one or other of the characters. The actions of each, therefore, were observed and his predisposition commented on in relation to his behaviour. The ability to infer the nature of a character, from his words or actions, or from information supplied by the author was apparent. Inferences of this kind, although partly based on personal values, were also the result of recognizing implications through previous personal experience.

The median was 18% for responses establishing a correct relationship between a character's thoughts and ideas, and his behaviour. Recognition of the intention, motivation, or reason for behaviour assisted in understanding both the nature of a character, and his feelings and attitudes. It was, therefore, important if loyalty towards a character was to be the outcome, and a sharing in his experiences. As in the case of the previous category, recognition of causal relationships other than those explicitly stated by the author, was partly dependent on previous experience.

Appropriate Reactions, the last of the five categories, had a median percentage of 27, which was the second highest. That was because, whatever the kind, a reaction based on accurate understanding was invariably an acceptable one. Frequently, imaginative participation in the action, adopting, as it were, the roles of the characters, was responsible for successful recognition of their experiences. This was particularly evident in the responses to Story No. 1, in which the main characters were children. The same kind of involvement was not possible with either of the other stories.

The above findings show the ability of the subjects to grasp the literal facts of the stories, and to apply various levels of interpretation to them. The following generalizations based on the findings may, in fact, be made.

1. When the language of the written material bore close affinity to the functional English of each subject, there was evidence of detailed observation of the facts of the stories.

2. With the above stipulation concerning language, there was a sensitive awareness of the tensions and emotions experienced by the characters.

3. When the behaviour, or emotional experiences of a character were recognized, there was understanding of the implications regarding his motivations and other cause and effect relationships.

4. Where human values were involved, there was evidence of a well-developed sense of social responsibility.

5. With the language stipulation mentioned above, there was abundant evidence of the ability of the subjects to enter vicariously into a recognized fictional experience with the same involvement as in real life, and of their willingness to change ideas and attitudes as a result.

Question 2. What evidence was provided of gaps in their comprehension?

Evidence of gaps between the ideas on the printed page and the ability of the readers to understand and interpret them was provided in the 781 Deviant responses, and in the median percentage of 34.5. The lowest individual percentage was 16, and the highest, 53.

Six categories of deviance contributed towards this result.

1. Wrong character identification. The characters were wrongly identified in various ways.
   a. Proper names were confused, and sometimes it was evident, the roles had been, too.
   b. Information supplied by the author relating to one character, was ascribed to another.
   c. The agent of an action was wrongly identified.
   d. The speaker of direct speech was confused with the listener.
2. Wrong reconstruction of the action. There were many errors in the reproduction of the facts of the stories.
   a. The presentation of details, or incidents in the stories gave evidence of inaccurate, or incorrect reconstruction.
   b. Details and incidents were apparently created and projected into the stories.
   c. The time sequence, particularly in Story No. 3, was confused.
   d. In response to each of the stories there was the occasional reversal of the time sequence.
3. Misunderstanding characters.
   a. Literal meaning was given to figurative language in some instances, and what had been intended by the author was not recognized.
   b. Significant details were sometimes avoided, or not recognized.
   c. Personal values were projected into the stories, and the character's intention ignored.
   d. The feelings and attitudes of the subjects were projected on to the characters.

4. Wrong associations. Characters were misunderstood through wrong associations.
   a. Predispositions were wrongly perceived through erroneous associations with known people.
   b. Prejudiced attitudes were the result in some cases of associating characters with those in films seen in the cinema or on the television.
5. Wrong relationships established. The relationship between a character's feelings, intentions, or motivations and his observed behaviour were wrongly established.
   a. Sometimes this was the result of giving to words a connotation different from that of the author.
   b. Key words, used by the author to indicate a relationship, were apparently ignored.
   c. Parts only, of complete ideas, were reproduced; the causal part was avoided.
6. Inappropriate reactions. These contained three kinds of responses.
   a. The feelings or emotions described could not have been those that had been aroused. The meanings of the words used to express the reaction appeared to have been confused.
   b. Behaviour prescribed for the characters, was inappropriate in the contexts of the stories.
   c. Literary criticism was unjust. It would seem to have been the result of failing to recognize the significance of the literary techniques used.

The median percentage of responses in the first subcategory was

16.5. Correct identification of the agent or the speaker was a problem for a number of subjects. It would seem that the cues, easily recognized by a fluent speaker of English, were not part of the linguistic behaviour of the subjects. Proper names were not recognized as a means of identifying characters. They were confused in an almost haphazard manner by a few. Information provided by means of noun or adverbial clauses, was a source of error to some; while the inability to recognize the exact words spoken, sometimes caused the speaker to be identified as the one spoken to. In none of the studies reviewed in Chapter 2, were problems such as these referred to specifically. They would appear to be the result of reading and language habits unique among subjects at this grade level.

There were many Wrong Reports of incidents and details in the stories. The median percentage for errors of this kind was 47, the highest of all the Deviant categories. Inaccurate or incorrect reconstruction invariably resulted from recognition of parts only of sentences or paragraphs, or of avoidance of parts. Avoidance probably followed recognition of the difficulty of certain passages. This, Meckel called rejection (1946). As Forman found that more was being extracted than had been presented by the author (1951), so there was evidence in this study of details and incidents added to what the author had supplied. These were created details, not valid inferences; they indicated partial recognition only of the reading material.

Lack of experience in responding to an author's style had been reported by both Richards (1966) and Meckel (1946). It was found in this study also, and the result was sometimes Misunderstanding the

Characters. The median percentage of this group was 33.5. Misunderstandings also arose from the projection of personal values into the story, apparently the result of observation of specific details, but not of their significance. The implication of such details was not recognized. In addition, feelings and emotions aroused in the subjects were projected on to the characters, in spite of evidence to the contrary. This was the result of involvement in the story as both an observer and a participant, and of confusing the roles. There was also identification with a character sufficient to enable the subjects to live vicariously through the incidents of the story, as Meckel had found in his study (1946). But these subjects apparently retained their own identity, and had the character feel as they did.

The median percentage was 15 for Wrong Associations. Recognized words, rather than recognized facts, sometimes aroused memories that were misleading. On the other hand, recognized behaviour was associated with live people whose motivations and predispositions were then projected on to the characters. This might have been the result of failing to recognize verbal clues provided by the author. The subjects seemed to search their own experience to find associations that would explain a character's behaviour. Correctly observed details apparently evoked associated memories of similar details seen in film presentations, but this did not remain at the level of the details. Much that did not apply, including the intention or the nature of characters, was projected into the stories.

The median of the responses giving evidence of failure to recognize causal relationships was 32.5%. When recognition was dependent

upon knowledge of the meanings of key words, or of the specific connotation of familiar words, it was often unsuccessful. Cross had found this problem—of subjects not having had the kind of experiences which would suggest the connotation intended by the author (1940). Squire had found similar difficulties (1956).

The median percentage was 45.5 for all the Inappropriate Reactions. Those which were attempts at literary criticism showed the same lack of scholarship and experience as had been remarked upon by Loban (1954), Squire (1964), and Richards (1966). Literary techniques were not recognized as such. There was an apparent lack of familiarity with these devices. Evidence of insufficient general experience of life had also been found by Richards (1966). The same lack of experience was evident in the inappropriate behaviour suggested for the characters in the stories. It would seem that a way of life known and familiar was projected on to the characters placed in an unfamiliar cultural environment.

Four generalizations might be made with regards to the above findings.

1. There was difficulty recognizing the roles of the characters when the linguistic cues given by the authors were unfamiliar.

2. There was difficulty recognizing the action and the plot when the vocabulary, and written language codes were unfamiliar.

3. There was difficulty recognizing the psychological or emotional experiences of the characters when the techniques used by the author were unfamiliar.

4. There was difficulty recognizing the experiences presented

when they were remote and unfamiliar.

Question 3. What factors may be identified as contributing to difficulties in comprehension?

Three groups of factors were identified as contributing to difficulties in comprehension. They were Experiential, Linguistic, and Reading factors. They each contained evidence of erroneous concepts brought to the reading of the stories, as well as resulting from it.

Experiential Factors

The numerical count of this group was 581, and the median percentage 33. The lowest individual score was 10%, and the highest 56%. Seven kinds of Experiential factors were found to be inhibiting accurate comprehension of the literary selections.

1. Didactic expectations. It seemed to be generally expected that the stories would demonstrate some moral or ethical principle. In other words, the stories were expected to give some advice about life.
   a. There was concern that young readers might be influenced by the "bad example" in the stories.
   b. The specific lesson or moral to be learned was identified.
   c. Statements were made indicating that specific stories were relevant only to readers of a certain age and sex.
2. Story-telling expectations. Authors were regarded as story tellers, not as literary artists.
   a. It was expected that all details considered necessary to the

understanding of the story would be provided by the author, or had been so provided.

b. The titles of the stories were expected to give direction with regards to the content of the stories.

c. It was also expected that the author would direct the reader's attention to the character from whom a lesson would be learned.

d. It was expected that the author had presented details in exact, precise language which would assist understanding.

3. Literal understandings. As a corollary to the Expectations given in 2. above, implied meanings were not recognized.

a. Only what had been stated specifically was truly part of the plot.

b. Actions and descriptions were regarded as literal facts with no further implications.

4. Background of the stories. There was evidence that an insufficient knowledge of the background or setting of the stories caused confusion.

a. The cultural setting of Stories No. 1 and No. 2 were not recognized.

(1) There were attempts to find "logical" causes of the rejection of characters.

(2) Expectations set were impossible to be achieved.

(3) Criticism of recognized behaviour was unjust.

b. The historical setting of Story No. 3 was not recognized.

(1) The nature of the character was misunderstood.

(2) The motivation of the character was misunderstood.

5. Personal experiences. Details of the stories were frequently seen in the light of personal experiences.
   a. Fictional experiences were interpreted according to personal experiences.
   b. Personal experiences were projected into the stories.
   c. Attitudes were evoked by associated personal experiences.
   d. The nature of the characters was wrongly perceived.
6. Personal culture. Ideas and values were projected into the stories.
   a. Parental control was ignored.
   b. There was a projection of a group culture into the stories.
   c. Parental responsibilities were prescribed.
   d. Details were interpreted in the light of personal behaviour.
      (1) Name calling.
      (2) Whispering.
      (3) Shaking hands.
7. Predetermined attitudes. Attitudes were not always the result of recognizing the behaviour of the characters.
   a. They were based on preconceived ideas of a character's role.
   b. They were based on stereotyped expectations.

Didactic Expectations had a decided influence on the understanding and interpretation of the selections. The median percentage of the recurrence of an indication that there was something to be learned from the stories was 36.5. Although the nature of the expectations may have differed, the findings of Meckel (1946), Loban (1963), and Squire (1964), were confirmed in this study. They found that a reader's "mental set" or "preoccupations" gave direction to his

reading. The subjects were very concerned with observing behaviour critically, and repeatedly made comments appraising a character's actions. The role of the author would seem to have been regarded as that of a story-teller. It was expected, therefore, that the stories would be true to life, and have some advice or relevance for the reader. Hence the interest in the sex and age of the author's intended readers.

There would also appear to have been expectations concerning the method of presentation. The median percentage of 26.5 for the second category indicated that this was so. The subjects did expect to make inferences and interpretations in relation to the facts of the stories, but they did not expect to infer the implied meaning of those facts. Belief in the printed word was found in this study as well as in those of Cross (1940) and Squire (1964).

The above finding was demonstrated in the subjects' Literal Understanding of the words of the texts. This factor had a median percentage of 12, for which evidence was found. Resistance by young readers to meanings implied in the stories has been remarked on by Cross (1940), Meckel (1946), Loban (1963), and Squire (1964). It would appear that most adolescents read stories expecting that all the facts would be given exactly and precisely by the author. After which they would be willing to interpret the significance of the facts in relation to their own lives.

Familiarity with the Background of the Stories was shown to have been a requirement in this study, for accurate comprehension. A median percentage of 39 was found for this factor. Where such

knowledge was not possessed by the subjects they viewed the incidents in the contexts of their own environment.

The median percentage of factors relating to Personal Experience was 52.5. This was the only factor in the Experiential group for one subject, which accounts for that median. Personal experiences played an important role in assisting comprehension when such experiences were relevant. They played just as significant a role in distracting readers away from the fictional experience when those remembered were unrelated to the incidents which appeared to have aroused them. It was clear that while memories were verbalized, no actual association was really involved. This was one of Squire's findings (1964). Even so, attitudes were affected by the memories probably more strongly than by the details which had evoked them. Personal experiences were also used to give meaning to the fictional ones, and inaccuracies, of course, resulted.

The next subcategory had a median percentage of 28.5. The Personal Culture of the subjects was projected into the stories in a number of ways, which confirmed a similar finding by Forman (1951). A number of details were viewed in very unique ways because of the ideas and beliefs projected into them. This finding had been made by Cross more than 30 years ago (1940). Behaviour habits as well as their significance, were also read into the recognized action in the stories.

Prejudiced Attitudes, with a median percentage of 30.5, was a cause of misunderstanding the characters in some instances, and of misjudging their intentions and their motives. When there were

preconceptions, evidence to the contrary would sometimes be ignored for a considerable part of the reading of the stories. This, too, had been found by Loban (1963) and Squire (1964). In a few instances they did not change.

It was evident that the final experience of the reader was the result both of what was understood from the story, and of the background of memories and associations which gave significance to it.

Linguistic Factors

The numerical count of the linguistic factors was the highest of the three main groups. There were 898 such factors identified; and the median percentage was 48. The total was made up of six different kinds.

1. Pronoun errors. The indiscriminate use of the personal pronoun, with regards to both gender and number, was scattered throughout the responses.
   a. Gender.
      (1) Both the masculine and the feminine forms were used in relation to the same referent.
      (2) The wrong gender of the pronoun was used.
      (3) The genitive form of the pronoun was given the gender of the noun it modified.
   b. Number.
      (1) The plural form was used for a singular referent.
      (2) The singular form was used for a plural referent.
2. Other syntactical errors. Errors other than pronoun errors.

a. Errors in the use of verbs were of four kinds.

(1) The present tense was used to the exclusion of any other by a few of the subjects.

(2) There was a lack of agreement in verb tenses.

(3) The wrong form of the verb was used in two of its functions.

(a) The wrong form of the past tense of irregular verbs.

(b) The function of the auxiliary verb was ignored.

(4) There was a lack of agreement between subject and verb.

b. The choice of function words showed confusion.

c. The significance of word order was not recognized.

3. Vocabulary deficiencies. There was evidence of a limited functional vocabulary.

a. Denotative meanings of words were not clearly grasped.

(1) Adjectives used to express ideas or feelings were inappropriate.

(2) Adjectives describing story details were used in an undifferentiated way.

b. Antonyms and near-synonyms of verbs were confused.

(1) Verbs indicating an exchange of items were wrongly used.

(2) Verbs indicating some form of speech were used indiscriminately.

4. Dialect and idiolect. Sentence patterns were not those usually heard among speakers in English.

a. There was a recurring pattern which could be termed "dialect."

(1) Both the pronoun and its antecedent were used as subject of the verb.

(2) Both the pronoun and its antecedent were used as object of the verb.

b. There was a form of the dialect which was quite unique, and could be termed "idiolect."

5. Unconventional character identification. The conventional method of identifying a character first by name, and substituting a pronoun in later references, was avoided in favour of two other methods.
   a. A description—almost hyphenated—of the role or behaviour of the characters was used. Both names and pronouns were avoided.
   b. Proper names were repeated and pronouns were avoided.
6. Inability to translate idiom. Three kinds of unsuccessful attempts were made to wrest meanings from the English idiom used in each story.
   a. Denotative meanings were given to the separate words.
   b. Single words were translated.
   c. The passage was paraphrased, but the idiom ignored.

Only four of the thirty-nine subjects made no errors in their use of the personal pronoun. The median percentage for this category was 40.5. Its persistent recurrence clearly indicated an absence of knowledge regarding the function of the different forms.

The same median of 40.5 was the percentage of other kinds of syntactical errors. In other words, the "stage of linguistic growth" of these subjects (Whitehead, 1966), does not include familiarity with the syntax of the English language. Nor does it include a confident use of a functional vocabulary. The median percentage of Vocabulary Deficiencies was 28.

The findings of the first three categories indicate the linguistic problems facing these grade eight subjects. They involve, as Wilson has pointed out, complicated issues (1966). And the issues do not become any less complex with regards to the unusual sentence patterns, or Dialect, used by the subjects. This factor had a median percentage of 38, while Unconventional Character Identification had one of 13.5. In view of these limitations, it is not surprising that the passages in the texts which contained an English idiom, were generally ignored. Where there was an attempt to understand such passages, the median percentage of the errors was 11.

Reading Factors

A lack of adequate experiences to enable them to become familiar with the conventional techniques of the written language, was apparent in the responses of the subjects. Of the total of 2091 inhibiting factors uncovered, 612 were in this classification. The lowest percentage was 8, and the highest, 56. The median percentage, therefore, was 32.

The seven specific categories identified have been outlined below.

1. Non-reading. A number of unsatisfactory methods was employed in attempts to obtain meaning from the selections.
   a. Key words or phrases were avoided in the oral reconstructions, with two negative results.
      (1) The ideas presented were incomplete.
      (2) The action itself was inaccurately reconstructed.

b. Isolated words and phrases which had been recognized were placed in a "logical" relationship with each other. What was then reported, was not what had been presented by the authors.

c. Whole passages which proved to be either too difficult or too unpleasant, were avoided, and time or causal relationships affected.

d. Difficult, or uncommon words and phrases were quoted exactly as they had been written, but in a wrong context.

2. Word recognition. The use of a word in the same context as the one in which the author had used a very similar word, would suggest failure in word recognition.

a. There was complete failure in a few instances.

b. There was recognition of parts of a word in more instances.

(1) Outstanding parts only were recognized.

(2) Digraphs were confused.

(3) Suffixes were avoided or changed.

(4) Parts only of compound words were recognized.

3. Author's techniques. The use of figurative language and other literary devices was not recognized.

a. The connotations of words were not those intended by the author.

b. The point of view as not being that of the author was not understood.

c. Figures of speech were translated literally.

d. The devices used to indicate flashback were not known.

4. Disregard of punctuation. There seemed to have been a lack of familiarity with the precise function of punctuation symbols.

a. There was failure to recognize the function of end punctuation.

b. There was failure to recognize the function of quotation marks.

c. There was failure to recognize the function of ellipses.

5. Complex sentence structure. Complex sentences proved to be too difficult for some subjects to unravel.

   a. The beginnings and endings were joined.

   b. The first part was made complete.

   c. The last part was made complete.

6. Projection of oral language. The unconventional speech patterns of the subjects were projected into the reading material.

   a. Dialect was projected into the written texts.

      (1) Referents were wrongly identified.

      (2) The limits of direct speech were not recognized, and punctuation symbols were disfunctional.

   b. An indiscriminate use of the personal pronoun was read into the stories.

7. Inability to identify referents. The methods used were apparent guessing, or the use of some code unknown to the investigator.

The many unsatisfactory methods employed by some subjects to obtain meaning from the selections were termed Non-reading, and had a median percentage of 55, which was extremely high for this kind of factor. Some subjects read only parts of sentences or of paragraphs. They avoided what would seem to have been too difficult to read, too difficult to understand, too difficult to fit into an idea already evoked, or too difficult to express. Others attempted to establish a relationship between separated, recognized words or phrases, and whole

passages were sometimes "read" in this way. Some subjects, therefore, were not reading, but were skimming for words or phrases that were familiar and which were used to express ideas of their own creation. They were also very skilful in using this technique, which appeared to be a substitution for complete failure to cope with the reading material.

The median percentage of apparent errors in Word Recognition was 17. However, since verbalization followed silent reading, substitutions may have been deliberately made in some instances. But there was evidence of failure in most cases. This study even provided an example of a single error in word recognition affecting the understanding of an entire story.

There was a median percentage of 21 with regards to Author's Techniques. Inability to recognize the author's intention in his choice of words was found by Richards (1966), Cross (1940), Loban (1954), and Squire (1964). The need for a reader to project intonation into the written material may have been partly responsible. With regards to the use of simile, which also was not recognized, the word "like" may have been given an ejaculatory function in the stories as in the subjects' oral language.

The Disregard of Punctuation received a median percentage of 28. As a general rule there was no evidence that problems with punctuation had, or had not been encountered. In relation to specific passages, however, and in reports of direct speech, it would seem that any known rules of punctuation were regarded as very flexible. Harris had also found that by disregarding the punctuation symbols, accurate

comprehension of a work may be affected (1948).

Complex Sentence Structure had a median percentage of 23. Those found in some of the passages were evidently too great a challenge to a number of subjects. Various ways of coping with them were, therefore, devised. But the results of analysis would seem to suggest that the difficulty of unravelling difficult sentence structure might be as much a linguistic problem as a reading one. Relative clauses or adverbial phrases were not recognized as such. The use of a compound subject was ignored, as was the use of a compound genitive. Such structures appeared to be totally unfamiliar to many subjects, and were ignored, or changed into structures less complicated.

In view of the findings discussed so far, Category 6 would appear to have been the inevitable solution to some of the difficulties encountered. Projection of Oral Language had a median percentage of 26. Because of it, disregard of punctuation symbols became obligatory. In their speech there seemed to be a need for the subjects to have both the pronoun and its referent in the same sentence. To project this sentence pattern into the direct speech in the selection, the quotation marks needed to be placed imaginatively before a proper name if the verb phrase outside them contained a pronoun. In the same way, if a proper name could be found within a sentence structure containing a pronoun, it was sometimes made the referent. The effect of such a technique could not have been other than to become a barrier to accurate comprehension.

The last category had a median percentage of 18. It could, however, almost be regarded as an extension of Category 6. There were

some structures in which there was a pronoun, but no proper name near enough to be considered its referent. The title of Story No. 2 is such an example. Guessing, or using some kind of "logical" decision was the method employed to have Alfred the referent of the pronoun for the majority of the subjects. And that method would seem to have been employed frequently. Inability to identify the antecedents of pronouns, however, is not unique to this group of subjects. Similar confusion had been remarked on by Harris many years ago (1948).

Although three kinds of inhibiting factors were identified which were termed Experiential, Linguistic, and Reading factors, the same principle underlay them all. There was evidence of gaps between the experiences, the spoken language, and the attitude towards a written language inherent in the selections, and those of the subjects. The difficulties facing the latter with regards to accurate comprehension were, therefore, impossible for them to overcome without a great deal of assistance. They were already using "their culture, their training, their habits, and all their experience" to enter into the fictional experiences and respond to them, as Forman had found with his subjects (1951). But for many of those taking part in this study, the result was not always accurate comprehension. It would even appear in some instances, that they were as unprepared for the task they were attempting to perform, as were the Indian students discovered by Rosenblatt to be studying Restoration comedies (1968). The difference was only one of degree.

Since the factors uncovered related directly to the accuracy with which the literary selections had been understood and interpreted,

generalizations have been made concerning the eight which seemed to have had the most seriously inhibiting effect.

1. The reader's degree of familiarity with the syntactical components of the English language, used as the medium of presentation of the selections, placed limits on his understanding of explicit details.

2. The semantical aspects also affected understandings of explicit details.

3. The reader's degree of familiarity with the English idiom affected his grasp of implied meanings.

4. Lack of familiarity with the verbal symbols, the sentence structure, and the stylistic techniques used in the written presentations, resulted in incongruous reporting.

5. Such reporting was also the result of disregarding the symbols used to indicate both pause and intonation, and the exact words spoken by the characters.

6. The reader's personal experiences and personal culture were projected into the selections in the absence of familiarity with those in the texts.

7. The oral language habits of the readers were projected into the written material in the absence of familiarity with the linguistic code, and the conventions of the written language, used in the presentation of the selections.

8. Attitudes were affected by what had been misunderstood, and by the reader's expectations regarding the purpose and method of presentation of the selections.

IMPLICATIONS FOR CURRICULUM

The difficulties summarized above arose because the subjects involved were attempting to interpret and respond to literary selections incorporating experiences, ideas, values, and beliefs, which it was evident, they did not share. Few of them would seem to be equipped to cope adequately with the provincial curriculum in Language Arts awaiting them in Grade 9.

The ability to adjust partially to unfamiliar experiences and language had, nevertheless, been demonstrated in the Acceptable responses. The ability to understand relationships implicit in the facts and the method of presentation of the narrative was also demonstrated. The degree of social sensitivity displayed, moreover, was highly commendable.

The need of a more enlightened approach to the educational problems peculiar to Indian children would seem to be indicated by the findings. Objectives capable of being reached appear to be needed, and modification of the curriculum sufficient to mitigate the problems facing Cree junior high school students. A second look might need to be given to the complexity of the materials chosen to obtain the objectives set.

Selection of Materials

The most successful of the three stories was "The Returning." It was not a simple story. The vocabulary was sophisticated, and so were many of the ideas it contained. There was little action. It could have failed, but it didn't. The final response to it was

overwhelmingly positive. It was even rated as "the best story that has ever been written." If a successful literary experience is the test of merit of a literary selection as held by Cecil (1950), Norvell (1950), and Burton (1957), then stories such as "The Returning" would seem to merit inclusion in the literature program for Indian children. In spite of its sophistication, there was some factor present to which the subjects responded, and which did not depend on the possession of specific reading skills.

"The Doll's House" on the other hand, which captured the imagination of the subjects, failed to evoke a positive response from the majority. Many seemed hurt or disappointed at the end because their hopes and expectations had not been realized. The Burnells continued to be "mean" to the Kelveys. Yet in the context of the story, it was impossible for the children of the two families to become friends because of the cultural setting, and the parent-child relationship which was not even noticed by some subjects. Others were bewildered. They did not find any lesson that they were prepared to learn. The behaviour of the Burnells was not that of "normal" children—that is, of Cree children—but they seemed to be normal. This kind of response is probably more damaging than a clearly negative one because of the involvement of the subjects. More care in the selection of stories to be used in the classroom is indicated here. The cultural setting was too remote from the way of life, or world view, of the readers. Mansfield's use of the possessive pronoun to identify "our Else" as the protagonist and to claim for her the reader's loyalty, either caused confusion or was avoided. Yet it is commonly used in England

among siblings, which fact would need to be known by a potential reader.

The response to "All the Years of Her Life" was generally negative, even from those subjects who had successfully grasped the literal facts. If did not seem to be true to life as this was known. Alfred was not a "normal" teenager, he was a "baby." It was expected that since he had got himself into trouble, he would "stand on his own feet" and get himself out. Mrs. Higgins was not a "normal" mother either, because no mother—that is, no Cree mother—would go to a store to get her son out of trouble. She was even blamed for doing so, and interest in the story dropped noticeably when she took him home with her. Thus, once again, what would appear to be the "world view" of the subjects was contradicted in the story. Indian children, it would seem, become responsible for their actions at an earlier age than is the case with non-Indians; and stories which would seem to teach otherwise will probably be resisted, as Loban had indicated (1949). There should, perhaps, be more care exercised in the choice of literary selections for Indian children than was given for those used in this study. A sharing of the values, and ways of looking at life, between the reader and a literary selection cannot be taken for granted.

In addition, the study of literature does not need to depend on written materials. Expansion of experiences can successfully be provided through the use of multi-media, and a functional knowledge of their techniques obtained through the creation of commercials, radio skits and short television plays. However, the reading material

provided, particularly for silent or recreational reading for which no preparation or assistance is given, would need careful selection. The subjects taking part in this study appear to be capable of coping with mature, sophisticated ideas. The experiential background and the functional linguistic knowledge of many would seem to be limiting factors, however. The use of high interest, low vocabulary reading material might prove successful with these subjects, and illustrated texts, particularly so.

Oral Language

The data suggest that greater attention to oral language activities in the earlier grades might be successful in preventing the frustrating language barriers evident in the responses of these Grade 8 subjects. There were innumerable interjections admitting to inadequacies such as "I can't express myself," "I don't know how to say it in English," "I can't find the right word." Since English is the language of communication in the schools likely to be attended by these subjects, mastery of basic English in the early grades would seem to be a prime objective.

The data has underlined the above objective to be a fundamental need, since evidence was provided of the projection of dialect into the written material. This, to the investigator, was the most significant finding in the analysis of the data. Yet it had been expected that familiar experiences only would have been recognized, and that interpretations would have been given to them in the context of the reader's personal background and training. It was evident, however,

that the use of language fits into a broad definition of experience. The habitual linguistic code of the subjects was the "familiar experience" sometimes recognized at the expense of what, in fact, had been written.

Opportunities for watching and taking part in activities might be expected to provide some experience, but a total one may require speaking and listening both during the activities, and after they had been completed. Providing and directing such activities might even take precedence over involvement with other forms of communication, since the linguistic factor was found to be the most inhibiting.

With regards to written communication, Jenkinson had indicated that a relationship might exist between oral language fluency and proficiency in reading (1957). Gray, in fact, declared that progress in reading is dependent upon a child's mastery of language (1956). The findings of this study support them both. It might, therefore, be theoretically sound to postpone the formal teaching of reading until some competence in the use of the English language is apparent.

That does not mean a long delay in the teaching of a written language. Children in the primary grades have some command of oral language, and experiences will already have been provided for extending and encouraging its use. As soon as possible a written one might be introduced, using the simple sentence structures of the pupil's own speech. An informal word display together with teacher-made charts would probably encourage the young child to write on his own. Thus he would provide his own reading material, and reading and writing would be introduced at the same time as the two aspects of a written

language. In any event, the use of authorized reading materials, particularly in the primary grades, might reasonably be postponed until the language fluency of the readers enable them to concentrate on "learning to read."

With regards to the junior high school, total integration of all aspects of language communication would appear to be needed in order for developmental language experiences to be provided. Activities involving oral language, creative writing, and listening might all be made preparatory to reading, and should, perhaps, take precedence over the formal teaching of reading in the elementary as well as the junior high school grades.

IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHERS

The significance of a reader's background of experiences on his interpretation of literary selections has been recognized for a considerable length of time (Richards, 1966; Cross, 1940; Forman, 1951). From the data it was found that two of the stories contained experiences in relation to home and family life, which were not those of the subjects. There was evidence that they were using personal experience and personal culture to try to grasp the meaning of the action. Even Story No. 3 failed to communicate a difference between the reservation of Willis Darkcat, and their own home environments.

The implication of this finding is two-fold. In the first place there is need of a sensitive awareness on the part of the teacher that the personal culture of the reader may be different from that contained in the story. Dixon strongly urged teachers to become familiar

with the personal culture the child brings to his reading (1967). Only by doing so, he maintained, may the culture of the child and that in the text be brought into "fruitful relationship" (p. 3).

In the second place, the need for background information had been verbalized by many, and its absence could be held responsible for some of the gaps in comprehension. Adequate preparation of the readers for the settings of the stories might have lessened the confusion caused by projecting into the literature, familiar beliefs, values, and environment, in place of those unknown. Concepts contained in the literature need to be known and understood before a successful literary experience may be expected. This may require of the teacher a carefully-planned presentation of the cultural, historical or geographical setting of the fictional experience. In other words, integration of literature with other subject matter areas may be needed to assist comprehension. But a multi-media approach to the presentation of background material would enable more successful visual reconstruction when the story itself was being read. However, when too much preparation of the readers would appear to be needed, it might be well not to use such stories.

Although placed after the discussion in relation to the Experiential factors, the Linguistic factors were found to be the most inhibiting. There was repeated evidence that the subjects were reading parts of the selections as if their oral language structures were those of the written material. A lack of precision with regards to both denotative and connotative meanings was apparent, as well as a limited range of shades of meanings of descriptive terms used. The

need of a greater store of synonyms was also evident.

The implications here are very clear. There is greater need of oral language activities in the programs of these subjects than might ordinarily be given. Activities to assist students to gain control over oral language would need to be carefully planned and carefully structured, beginning at their present level of language development. Simple sentence structures were those most frequently used in this study. Ideas were added to ideas by the use of the conjunction "and." Expansion into more complex structures would need to be encouraged. Informal dramatics or role play might be used, but since some of the features of language learning are imitative, preparatory listening to stories read by the teacher, or presented on the radio or tape-recorder, might be productive. For junior high school students in non-Indian schools further opportunities for both speaking and listening would be found in small group discussions.

Verb tense and the use of the auxiliary verbs appear to need frequent and consistent attention to facilitate manipulation of these linguistic factors. They could be the essential directives in relation to the time factor of narrated details. The need of much individual work would seem to be suggested by the data, but for all of the subjects the use of the pronoun in an English sentence requires both formal and informal, individual and class instruction.

The vocabulary in the stories was often avoided, quoted exactly, or wrongly translated. This would indicate that part of the preparation for the reading of any specific story might include vocabulary study such as is part of the reading preparation used in the elementary

grades. In addition stories which contain sentence structures such as were used by Mansfield, would appear to be too difficult for the subjects to read on their own. If similar stories were to be taken with the class, reading by the teacher would probably be more effective in evoking a satisfying experience.

Another cause of failure to understand the facts of the stories was found in the lack of experience with the literary techniques used. While interpretation of a literary selection, as well as response to it, are individual and personal to a certain extent, comprehension of the facts of the stories is not. One very important factor inhibiting accurate comprehension was the failure to distinguish between explicit literal facts, and those implied by the use of point of view, figurative language, and idiom. A literal translation was given each time the latter devices were met. Familiarity with these techniques is basic to the understanding of a literary selection. Inadequate preparation of readers to enable them to recognize and respond to the language and intention of the authors was found in all the studies reviewed in Chapter 2. This would seem to suggest that after any specific literary technique has been taught, many more experiences with the translation of passages using that technique would be needed. In addition, creative writing using specific literary devices might assist their recognition.

Finally, it was found that familiarity with the conventions of the written language, not only the use of complex sentence structures but also the function of punctuation symbols, was not part of the reading repertoire of the subjects. This, according to Harris (1948), is

an essential requirement for accurate comprehension. The symbols which indicated both the pause and the intonation, were disregarded. Those were ignored, too, which affected the meaning of a passage, and those used to indicate the exact words of a character. The use of quotation marks, and of the apostrophe, caused difficulties. Punctuation clearly needs to be systematically taught, and recurring attention given to developing the skill of changing direct into reported speech, and vice versa.

The technique used in this study, of having students respond freely to literary selections, might be used to give direction to future lessons. It might also provide insights with regards to personal interpretations.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Areas of research suggested by the present study might be the following.

1. A further probing into the relationship between fluency in language and reading comprehension appears to be indicated.

2. The English pronoun, it would seem from the data, has a much more significant role to play in language communication than might have been realized. Research into its use and misuse might produce interesting findings.

3. A study such as the present one, with non-Indian subjects, could uncover possible barriers to comprehension.

4. Literary selections, incorporating the values and cultural backgrounds of widely separated geographical regions, might prove

effective in discovering the kinds of general background knowledge required by a reader.

5. Analysis of free oral responses to other types of literature—for example, poetry—could indicate difficulties encountered with that genre.

6. Exploration of the relationship between knowledge of punctuation symbols, and their actual function with regards to junior high school readers could be of interest.

CONCLUSION

The study was an investigation into the difficulties encountered by junior high school Cree subjects, while reading and responding to three literary selections.

Three sources of difficulty were identified, and insights into some of the factors which caused them were provided by examination of the data.

The special problems of these students were discussed, and the importance of providing material relevant to the needs and interests of the readers.

Suggestions for further research were made, which might prove to be of interest in relation to this study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, R. L. "The Structure of Meaning," Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguistics, H. G. Hunt, editor. London: Mouton and Company, 1964. Pp. 421-6.

Berelson, Bernard. Content Analysis in Communication Research. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1952.

Bley, Edgard S. "Identification: A Key to Literature," The English Journal, 34:26-32, 1945.

Britton, J. N. "Evidence of Improvement in Poetic Judgment," The British Journal of Psychology, 11:196-208, 1954.

Browning, R. "The Bishop Orders His Tomb at St. Praxed's Church," Major British Writers, G. B. Harrison et al, editors. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1959. Pp. 490-2.

Burton, Dwight L. "Literature and the Heightened Mind," The Educational Forum, 21:185-90, 1957.

_____ (ed.). Reading Instruction in Secondary Schools. Perspectives in Reading, No. 2. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1957.

_____. "The Relationship of Literary Appreciation to Certain Measurable Factors," The Journal of Educational Psychology, 43:436-9, 1952.

Callaghan, Morley. "All the Years of Her Life," A Harvest of Short Stories, John M. Donohue and Marjorie E. McIntosh, editors. Toronto: Longmans, Canada, Limited, 1964. Pp. 151-6.

Cannell, Charles F. and Robert L. Kahn. "The Collection of Data by Interviewing," Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences, Leon Festinger and Daniel Katz, editors. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953. Pp. 327-79.

Carroll, J. B. Language and Thought. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Cecil, Lord David. Reading as One of the Fine Arts. London: Oxford University Press, 1950.

Cross, Neal M. "The Background for Misunderstanding," The English Journal, 29:366-70, 1940.

Crossen, Helen J. "Effects of the Attitudes of the Reader upon Critical Reading Ability," The Journal of Educational Research, 42:289-98, 1948.

Davies, Sarah. "English Language and Literature," Approaches to Adult Teaching, N. Dees, editor. New York: Pergamon Press, 1965. Pp. 99-122.

de Paola, Daniel. "The Returning," The Prairie Schooner, 38:2-13, 1964.

Dixon, John. Growth Through English. Reading, England: National Association for the Teaching of English, 1967.

Fischer, Carl (ed.). Prep-Program: Short Stories. Dayton, Ohio: George A. Pflaum, 1966.

Fisher, Helen. "Family Life in Children's Literature," The Elementary School Journal, 50:516-20, 1950.

Forehand, Garlie A. "Problems of Measuring Responses to Literature," The Clearing House, 40:369-70, 1966.

Forman, E. "An Instrument to Evaluate the Literary Appreciation of Adolescents." Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1951. (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, Microfilm number 3137.)

Fries, C. C. The Structure of English: an Introduction to the Construction of English Sentences. New York: Harcourt and Brace, 1952.

Gray, William S. The Teaching of Reading and Writing: An International Survey, U.N.E.S.C.O. Chicago, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1956.

Harding, D. W. "Psychological Processes in the Reading of Fiction," The British Journal of Aesthetics, 2:133-47, 1962.

_____. "Response to Literature: The Report of the Study Group," Response to Literature, J. R. Squire, editor. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1968. Pp. 11-27.

Harris, Chester W. "Measurement of Comprehension in Literature," The School Review, 61:280-9, 1948.

_____. "Measurement of Comprehension of Literature and Its Relation to Enjoyment." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1946.

Havighurst, Robert J. and Bernice L. Neugarten. American Indian and White Children. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Hayakawa, S. I. Language in Thought and Action. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Incorporated, 1964.

Hunt, Kellogg W. Grammatical Structures Written at Three Grade Levels. National Council of Teachers of English Research Report No. 3. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965.

Jacobs, Leland B. "Culture Patterns in Children's Fiction," Childhood Education, 23:431-4, 1947.

Jenkinson, M. D. "Selected Processes and Difficulties of Reading Comprehension." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1957.

Jesperson, Otto H. Language: Its Nature, Development and Origin. New York: W. W. Norton Company, 1964.

Loban, Walter. "Adolescents of Varying Sensitivity and their Responses to Literature Intended to Evoke Sympathy." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1949.

_____. The Language of Elementary School Children. National Council of Teachers of English Research Report No. 1. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.

_____. Literature and Social Sensitivity. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1954.

Malinowski, Bronislaw. "Supplement I," The Meaning of Meaning, C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Incorporated, 8th edition, 1964.

Mansfield, Katherine. "The Doll's House," A Harvest of Short Stories, J. M. Donohue and Marjorie E. McIntosh, editors. Toronto: Longmans, Canada, Limited, 1964. Pp. 67-74.

Meckel, Henry C. "An Exploratory Study of the Responses of Adolescent Pupils to Situations in a Novel." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1946.

_____. "Research Designs Needed in Studying the Teaching of Language and Literature in the Secondary School," Research Design and the Teaching of English. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963. Pp. 87-91.

Norvell, George W. The Reading Interest of Young People. Boston: D. C. Heath & Company, 1950.

Piekarz, J. A. "Individual Differences in Interpretive Responses in Reading." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1954.

Piekarz, J. A. "Getting Meaning from Reading," The Elementary School Journal, 56:303-9, 1956.

Pollock, T. C. The Nature of Literature: Its Relation to Science, Language and Human Experience. New York: Gordian Press, 1965.

Richards, I. A. Practical Criticism: A Study in Literary Judgment. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966.

Rosenblatt, Louise M. Literature as Exploration. New York: Noble and Noble, 1968.

Rosenheim, Edmund W. What Happens in Literature. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Rudman, Herbert C. "Informational Needs and Reading Interests of Children in Grades IV through VIII," The Elementary School Journal, 55:502-12, 1955.

Sapir, Edward. Language. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1949.

Sherwin, J. S. "Patterns of Assumptions in a High School Literature Curriculum," The Journal of Educational Sociology, 29:321-9, 1956.

Squire, James R. "The Responses of Adolescents to Literature Involving Selected Experiences of Personal Development." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1956.

_____. The Responses of Adolescents while Reading Four Short Stories. National Council of Teachers of English Research Report No. 2. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964.

Taba, H. With Perspective on Human Relations: A Study of Peer Group Dynamics in an Eighth Grade. Washington: American Council of Education, 1955.

Tyler, Ralph W. Basic Principles of Curriculum Instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1970.

Watts, A. F. The Language and Mental Development of Children. Toronto: G. G. Harrop and Company, 1960.

Wellek, R. and A. Warren. Theory of Literature. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1956.

Whitehead, F. The Disappearing Dais: A Study of the Principles and Practices in English Teaching. London: Chatto and Windus, 1966.

Whitehead, F. "Gleanings," Response to Literature, J. R. Squire, editor. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1966. Pp. 49-75.

Wilson, James. Responses of College Freshmen to Three Novels. National Council of Teachers of English Research Report No. 7. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1966.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

THE STORIES

THE DOLL'S HOUSE

Section 1:

When dear old Mrs. Hay went back to town after staying with the Burnells, she sent the children a doll's house. It was so big that the carter and Pat carried it into the courtyard, and there it stayed, propped up on two wooden boxes beside the feed-room door. No harm could come to it; it was summer. And perhaps the smell of paint would have gone off by the time it had to be taken in. For really, the smell of paint coming from that doll's house ("Sweet of old Mrs. Hay, of course; most sweet and generous!")—but the smell of paint was quite enough to make anyone seriously ill, in Aunt Beryl's opinion. Even before the sacking was taken off. And when it was . . .

There stood the doll's house, a dark, oily, spinach green, picked out with bright yellow. Its two solid little chimneys, glued on to the roof, were painted red and white, and the door, gleaming with yellow varnish, was like a little slab of toffee. Four windows, real windows, were divided into panes by a broad streak of green. There was actually a tiny porch, too, painted yellow, with big lumps of congealed paint hanging along the edge.

But perfect, perfect little house! Who could possibly mind the smell. It was part of the joy, part of the newness.

"Open it quickly, someone!"

The hook at the side was stuck fast. Pat pried it open with his penknife, and the whole house front swung back, and—there you were, gazing at one and the same time into the drawing room, the kitchen, and two bedrooms. That is the way for a house to open! Why don't all houses open like that? How much more exciting than peering through the slit of a door into a mean little hall with a hat-stand and two umbrellas! That is - isn't it? - what you long to know about a house when you put your hand on the knocker. Perhaps it is the way God opens houses when He is taking a quiet turn with an angel . . .

"O-Oh!" The Burnell children sounded as though they were in despair. It was too marvellous; it was too much for them. They had never seen anything like it in their lives. All the rooms were papered. There were pictures on the walls, painted on the paper, with gold frames complete. Red carpet covered all the floors except the kitchen; red plush chairs in the drawing room, green in the dining room; tables, beds and real bedclothes, a cradle, a stove, a dresser with tiny plates and one big jug. But what Kezia liked more than anything, what she liked frightfully, was the lamp. It stood in the middle of the dining room table, an exquisite little amber lamp with a white globe. It was even filled all ready for lighting, though,

of course, you couldn't light it. But there was something inside that looked like oil, and that moved when you shook it.

The father and mother dolls, who sprawled very stiff as though they had fainted in the drawing room, and their two little children asleep upstairs, were really too big for the doll's house. They didn't look as though they belonged. But the lamp was perfect. It seemed to smile at Kezia, to say: "I live here." The lamp was real.

Section 2:

The Burnell children could hardly walk to school fast enough the next morning. They burned to tell everybody, to describe, to - well - to boast about their doll's house before the school bell rang.

"I'm to tell," said Isabel, "because I'm the eldest. And you two can join in after. But I'm to tell first."

There was nothing to answer. Isabel was bossy, but she was always right, and Lottie and Kezia knew too well the powers that went with being eldest. They brushed through the thick buttercups at the road edge and said nothing.

"And I'm to choose who's to come and see it first. Mother said I might."

For it had been arranged that while the doll's house stood in the courtyard they might ask the girls at school, two at a time, to come and look. Not to stay to tea, of course, or to come traipsing through the house. But just to stand quietly in the courtyard while Isabel pointed out the beauties and Lottie and Kezia looked pleased. . .

But hurry as they might, by the time they had reached the tarred palings of the boys' playground the bell had begun to jangle. They only just had time to whip off their hats and fall into line before the roll was called. Never mind. Isabel tried to make up for it by looking very important and mysterious and by whispering behind her hand to the girls near her: "Got something to tell you at play-time."

Playtime came and Isabel was surrounded. The girls of her class nearly fought to put their arms round her, to walk away with her, to beam flatteringly, to be her special friend. She held quite a court under the huge pine trees at the side of the playground. Nudging, giggling together, the little girls pressed up close. And the only two who stayed outside the ring were the two who were always outside, the little Kelveys. They knew better than to come anywhere near the Burnells.

For the fact was the school the Burnell children went to was

not at all the kind of place their parents would have chosen if there had been any choice. But there was none. It was the only school for miles. And the consequence was that all the children in the neighbourhood, the Judge's little girls, the doctor's daughters, the storekeeper's children, the milkman's, were forced to mix together. Not to speak of there being an equal number of rude, rough little boys as well. But the line had to be drawn somewhere. It was drawn at the Kelveys. Many of the children, including the Burnells, were not allowed even to speak to them. They walked past the Kelveys with their heads in the air, and as they set the fashion in all matters of behaviour, the Kelveys were shunned by everybody. Even the teacher had a special voice for them, and a special smile for the other children when Lil Kelvey came up to her desk with a bunch of dreadful common-looking flowers.

Section 3:

They were the daughters of the spry, hardworking little washerwoman, who went about from house to house by the day. This was awful enough. But where was Mr. Kelvey? Nobody knew for certain. But everybody said he was in prison. So they were the daughters of a washerwoman and a jailbird. Very nice company for other people's children! And they looked it. Why Mrs. Kelvey made them so conspicuous was hard to understand. The truth was they were dressed in "bits" given to her by people for whom she worked. Lil, for instance, who was a stout, plain child, with big freckles, came to school in a dress made from a green art-serge tablecloth of the Burnells with red plush sleeves from the Logans' curtains. Her hat, perched on top of her high forehead, was a grown-up woman's hat, once the property of Miss Lecky, the post-mistress. It was turned up at the back and trimmed with a large scarlet quill. What a little guy she looked! It was impossible not to laugh. And her sister, our Else, wore a long white dress, rather like a nightgown, and a pair of little boy's boots. But whatever Else wore, she would have looked strange. She was a tiny wishbone of a child, with cropped hair and enormous solemn eyes - a little white owl. Nobody had ever seen her smile; she scarcely ever spoke. She went through life holding on to Lil, with a piece of Lil's skirt screwed up in her hand. Where Lil went our Else followed. In the playground, on the road going to and from school, there was Lil marching in front and our Else holding on behind. Only when she wanted anything, or when she was out of breath, our Else gave Lil a tug, a twitch, and Lil stopped and turned round. The Kelveys never failed to understand each other.

Now they hovered at the edge; you couldn't stop them listening. When the little girls turned round and sneered, Lil, as usual, gave her silly, shamefaced smile, but our Else only looked.

And Isabel's voice, so very proud, went on telling. The carpet made a great sensation, but so did the beds with real bedclothes, and

the stove with an oven door.

When she finished, Kezia broke in, "You've forgotten the lamp, Isabel."

"Oh, yes," said Isabel, "and there's a teeny little lamp, all made of yellow glass, with a white globe, that stands on the dining-room table. You couldn't tell it from a real one."

"The lamp's best of all," cried Kezia. She thought Isabel wasn't making half enough of the little lamp. But nobody paid any attention. Isabel was choosing the two who were to come back with them that afternoon and see it. She chose Emmie Cole and Lena Logan. But when the others knew they were all to have a chance, they couldn't be nice enough to Isabel. One by one they put their arms round Isabel's waist and walked her off. They had something to whisper to her, a secret. "Isabel's my friend."

Only the little Kelveys moved away forgotten; there was nothing more for them to hear.

Section 4:

Days passed by, and more children saw the doll's house; the fame of it spread. It became the one subject, the rage. The one question was: "Have you seen the Burnells' doll's house? Oh, ain't it lovely!" "Haven't you seen it? Oh, I say!"

Even the dinner hour was given up to talking about it. The little girls sat under the pines eating their thick mutton sandwiches and big slabs of johnnycake spread with butter. While always, as near as they could get, sat the Kelveys, our Else holding on to Lil, listening too, while they chewed their jam sandwiches out of a newspaper soaked with large red blobs . . .

"Mother," said Kezia, "can't I ask the Kelveys just once?"

"Certainly not, Kezia."

"But why not?"

"Run away, Kezia; you know quite well why not."

At last everybody had seen it except them. On that day the subject rather flagged. It was the dinner hour. The children stood together under the pine trees, and suddenly, as they looked at the Kelveys eating out of their paper, always by themselves, always listening, they wanted to be horrid to them. Emmie Cole started the whisper.

"Lil Kelvey's going to be a servant when she grows up."

"O-oh, how awful!" said Isabel Burnell, and she made eyes at Emmie.

Emmie swallowed in a very meaningful way and nodded to Isabel as she'd seen her mother do on these occasions.

"It's true - it's true - it's true," said she.

Then Lena Logan's little eyes snapped. "Shall I ask her?" she whispered.

"Bet you don't," said Jessie May.

"Pooh, I'm not frightened," said Lena. Suddenly she gave a little squeal and danced in front of the other girls. "Watch! Watch me! Watch me now!" said Lena. And sliding, gliding, dragging one foot, giggling behind her hand, Lena went over to the Kelveys.

Lil looked up from her dinner. She wrapped the rest quickly away. Our Else stopped chewing. What was coming now?

"Is it true you're going to be a servant when you grow up, Lil Kelvey?" shrilled Lena.

Dead silence. But instead of answering, Lil gave her silly, shamefaced smile. She didn't seem to mind the question at all. What a sell for Lena! The girls began to titter.

Lena couldn't stand that. She put her hands on her hips, she shot forward. "Yah, your father's in prison!" she hissed spitefully.

This was such a marvelous thing to have said that the little girls rushed away in a body, deeply, deeply excited, wild with joy. Someone found a long rope, and they began skipping. And never did they skip so high, run in and out so fast, or do such daring things as on that morning.

Section 5:

In the afternoon Pat called for the Burnell children with a buggy and they drove home. There were visitors. Isabel and Lottie, who liked visitors, went upstairs to change their pinafores. But Kezia thieved out at the back. Nobody was about; she began to swing on the big white gate of the courtyard. Presently, looking along the road, she saw two little dots. They grew bigger, they were coming towards her. Now she could see that one was in front and one was close behind. Now she could see that they were the Kelveys. Kezia stopped swinging. She slipped off the gate as if she was going to

run away. Then she hesitated. The Kelveys came nearer, and beside them walked their shadows, very long, stretching right across the road with their heads in the buttercups. Kezia clambered back on the gate; she had made up her mind; she swung out.

"Hullo," she said to the passing Kelveys.

They were so astounded that they stopped. Lil gave her silly smile. Our Else stared.

"You can come and see our doll's house if you want to," said Kezia, and she dragged one toe on the ground. But at that Lil turned red and shook her head quickly.

"Why not?" said Kezia.

Lil gasped and said: "Your ma told our ma you wasn't to speak to us."

"Oh, well," said Kezia. She didn't know what to reply. "It doesn't matter. You can come and see our doll's house all the same. Come on. Nobody's looking."

But Lil shook her head still harder.

"Don't you want to?" asked Kezia.

Suddenly there was a twitch, a tug at Lil's skirt. She turned round. Our Else was looking at her with big, imploring eyes, she was frowning, she wanted to go. For a moment Lil looked at our Else very doubtfully. But then our Else twitched her skirt again. She started forward. Kezia led the way. Like two little stray cats they followed across the courtyard to where the doll's house stood.

"There it is," said Kezia.

There was a pause. Lil breathed loudly, almost snorted; our Else was still as a stone.

"I'll open it for you," said Kezia kindly. She undid the hook and they looked inside.

"There's the drawing room and the dining room, and that's the --"

"Kezia!"

Oh, what a start they gave!

"Kezia!"

It was Aunt Beryl's voice. They turned round. At the back door stood Aunt Beryl, staring as if she couldn't believe what she saw.

Section 6:

"How dare you ask the little Kelveys into the courtyard?" said her cold, furious voice. "You know as well as I do you're not allowed to talk to them. Run away, children, run away at once. And don't come back again," said Aunt Beryl. And she stepped into the yard and shooed them out as if they were chickens.

"Off you go immediately!" she called, cold and proud.

They did not need telling twice. Burning with shame, shrinking together, Lil huddling along like her mother, our Else dazed, somehow they crossed the big courtyard and squeezed through the white gate.

"Wicked, disobedient little girl!" said Aunt Beryl bitterly to Kezia, as she slammed the doll's house to.

The afternoon had been awful. A letter had come from Willie Brent, a terrifying, threatening letter, saying if she did not meet him that evening in Pulman's Bush, he'd come to the front door and ask the reason why! But now that she had frightened those little rats of Kelveys and given Kezia a good scolding, her heart felt lighter. That ghastly pressure was gone. She went back to the house humming.

When the Kelveys were well out of sight of Burnell's they sat down to rest on a big red drainpipe by the side of the road. Lil's cheeks were still burning; she took off the hat with the quill and held it on her knee. Dreamily they looked over the hay paddocks, past the creek, to the group of wattles where the Logans' cows stook waiting to be milked. What were their thoughts?

Presently our Else nudged up close to her sister. By now she had forgotten the cross lady. She put out a finger and stroked her sister's quill, and smiled her rare smile.

"I seen the little lamp," she said softly.

Then both were silent once more.

ALL THE YEARS OF HER LIFE

Section 1:

They were closing the drugstore, and Alfred Higgins, who had just taken off his white jacket, was putting on his coat and getting ready to go home. The little gray-haired man, Sam Carr, who owned the drugstore, was bending down behind the cash register, and when Alfred Higgins passed him, he looked up and said softly, "Just a moment, Alfred. One moment before you go."

The soft, confident, quiet way in which Sam Carr spoke made Alfred start to button his coat nervously. He felt sure his face was white. Sam Carr usually said, "Good Night," brusquely, without looking up. In the six months he had been working in the drugstore Alfred had never heard his employer speak softly like that. His heart began to beat so loud it was hard for him to get his breath. "What is it, Mr. Carr?" he asked.

"Maybe you'd be good enough to take a few things out of your pocket and leave them before you go," Sam Carr said.

"What things? What are you talking about?"

"You've got a compact and a lipstick and at least two tubes of toothpaste in your pockets, Alfred."

"What do you mean? Do you think I'm crazy?" Alfred blustered. His face got red and he knew he looked fierce with indignation. But Sam Carr, standing by the door with his blue eyes shining bright behind his glasses and his lips moving underneath his gray mustache, only nodded his head a few times, and then Alfred grew very frightened and he didn't know what to say. Slowly he raised his hand and dipped into his pocket, and with his eyes never meeting Sam Carr's eyes, he took out a blue compact and two tubes of toothpaste and a lipstick, and he laid them one by one on the counter.

"Petty thieving, eh, Alfred?" Sam Carr said. "And maybe you'd be good enough to tell me how long this has been going on."

"This is the first time I ever took anything."

"So now you think you'll tell me a lie, eh? What kind of a sap do I look like, huh? I don't know what goes on in my own store, eh? I tell you you've been doing this pretty steady," Sam Carr said as he went over and stood behind the cash register.

Ever since Alfred had left school he had been getting into trouble wherever he worked. He lived at home with his mother and his father, who was a printer. His two older brothers were married and

his sister had got married last year, and it would have been all right for his parents now if Alfred had only been able to keep a job.

While Sam Carr smiled and stroked the side of his face very delicately with the tips of his fingers, Alfred began to feel that familiar terror growing in him that had been in him every time he had got into such trouble.

"I liked you," Sam Carr was saying. "I liked you and would have trusted you, and now look what I got to do." While Alfred watched with his alert, frightened blue eyes, Sam Carr drummed with his fingers on the counter. "I don't like to call a cop in point-blank," he was saying as he looked very worried. "You're a fool, and maybe I should call your father and tell him you're a fool. Maybe I should let them know I'm going to have you locked up."

"My father's not at home. He's a printer. He works nights," Alfred said.

"Who's at home?"

"My mother, I guess."

"Then we'll see what she says." Sam Carr went to the phone and dialed the number. Alfred was not so much ashamed, but there was that deep fright growing in him, and he blurted out arrogantly, like a strong, full-grown man, "Just a minute. You don't need to draw anybody else in. You don't need to tell her." He wanted to sound like a swaggering, big guy who could look after himself, yet the old, childish hope was in him, the longing that someone at home would come and help him. "Yeah, that's right, he's in trouble," Mr. Carr was saying. "Yeah, your boy works for me. You'd better come down in a hurry." And when he was finished Mr. Carr went over to the door and looked out at the street and watched the people passing in the late summer night. "I'll keep my eye out for a cop," was all he said.

Section 2:

Alfred knew how his mother would come rushing in; she would rush in with her eyes blazing, or maybe she would be crying, and she would push him away when he tried to talk to her, and make him feel her dreadful contempt; yet he longed that she might come before Mr. Carr saw the cop on the beat passing the door.

While they waited - and it seemed a long time - they did not speak, and when at last they heard someone tapping on the closed door, Mr. Carr, turning the latch, said crisply, "Come in, Mrs. Higgins." He looked hard-faced and stern.

Mrs. Higgins must have been going to bed when he telephoned, for her hair was tucked in loosely under her hat, and her hand at her throat held her light coat tight across her chest so her dress would not show. She came in, large and plump, with a little smile on her friendly face. Most of the store lights had been turned out and at first she did not see Alfred, who was standing in the shadow at the end of the counter. Yet as soon as she saw him she did not look as Alfred thought she would look: she smiled, her blue eyes never wavered, and with a calmness and dignity that made them forget that her clothes seemed to have been thrown on her, she put out her hand to Mr. Carr and said politely, "I'm Mrs. Higgins. I'm Alfred's mother."

Mr. Carr was a bit embarrassed by her lack of terror and her simplicity, and he hardly knew what to say to her, so she asked, "Is Alfred in trouble?"

Section 3:

"He is [in trouble]. He's been taking things from the store. I caught him redhanded. Little things like compacts and toothpaste and lipsticks. Stuff he can sell easily," the proprietor said.

As she listened Mrs. Higgins looked at Alfred sometimes and nodded her head sadly, and when Sam Carr had finished she said gravely, "Is it so, Alfred?"

"Yes."

"Why have you been doing it?"

"I been spending money, I guess."

"On what?"

"Going around with the guys, I guess," Alfred said.

Mrs. Higgins put out her hand and touched Sam Carr's arm with an understanding gentleness, and speaking as though afraid of disturbing him, she said, "If you would only listen to me before doing anything." Her simple earnestness made her shy; her humility made her falter and look away, but in a moment she was smiling gravely again, and she said with a kind of patient dignity, "What did you intend to do, Mr. Carr?"

"I was going to get a cop. That's what I ought to do."

"Yes, I suppose so. It's not for me to say, because he's my son. Yet I sometimes think a little good advice is the best thing for a boy when he's at a certain period in his life," she said.

Alfred couldn't understand his mother's quiet composure, for if they had been at home and someone had suggested that he was going to be arrested, he knew she would be in a rage and would cry out against him. Yet now she was standing there with that gentle, pleading smile on her face, saying, "I wonder if you don't think it would be better just to let him come home with me. He looks a big fellow, doesn't he? It takes some of them a long time to get any sense," and they both stared at Alfred, who shifted away with a bit of light shining for a moment on his thin face and the tiny pimples over his cheekbone.

Section 4:

But even while he was turning away uneasily Alfred was realizing that Mr. Carr had become aware that his mother was really a fine woman; he knew that Sam Carr was puzzled by his mother, as if had expected her to come in and plead with him tearfully, and instead he was being made to feel a bit ashamed by her vast tolerance. While there was only the sound of the mother's soft assured voice in the store, Mr. Carr began to nod his head encouragingly at her. Without being alarmed, while being just large and still and simple and hopeful, she was becoming dominant there in the dimly lit store. "Of course, I don't want to be harsh," Mr. Carr was saying. "I'll tell you what I'll do. I'll just fire him and let it go at that. How's that?" and he got up and shook hands with Mrs. Higgins, bowing low to her in deep respect.

There was such warmth and gratitude in the way she said, "I'll never forget your kindness," that Mr. Carr began to feel warm and genial himself.

"Sorry we had to meet this way," he said. "But I'm glad I got in touch with you. Just wanted to do the right thing, that's all," he said.

"It's better to meet like this than never, isn't it?" he said. Suddenly they clasped hands as if they liked each other, as if they had known each other a long time. "Good night, sir," she said.

"Good night, Mrs. Higgins. I'm truly sorry," he said.

Section 5:

The mother and son walked along the street together, and the mother was taking a long, firm stride as she looked ahead with her stern face full of worry. Alfred was afraid to speak to her, he was afraid of the silence that was between them, so he only looked ahead too, for the excitement and relief were still pretty strong in him; but in a little while, going along like that in silence made him terribly aware of the strength and sternness in her; he began to wonder what she was thinking of as she stared ahead so grimly; she

seemed to have forgotten that he walked beside her; so when they were passing under the Sixth Avenue elevated and the rumble of the train seemed to break the silence, he said in his old, blustering way, "Thank God it turned out like that. I certainly won't get in a jam like that again."

"Be quiet. Don't speak to me. You've disgraced me again and again," she said bitterly.

"That's the last time. That's all I'm saying."

"Have the decency to be quiet," she snapped. They kept on their way, looking straight ahead.

When they were at home and his mother took off her coat, Alfred saw that she was really only half-dressed, and she made him feel afraid again when she said, without looking at him, "You're a bad lot. God forgive you. It's one thing after another and always has been. Why do you stand there stupidly? Go to bed, why don't you?" When he was going, she said, "I'm going to make myself a cup of tea. Mind, now, not a word about tonight to your father."

Section 6:

While Alfred was undressing in his bedroom, he heard his mother moving around the kitchen. She filled the kettle and put it on the stove. She moved a chair. And as he listened there was no shame in him, just wonder and a kind of admiration of her strength and repose. He could still see Sam Carr nodding his head encouragingly to her; he could hear her talking simply and earnestly, and as he sat on his bed he felt a pride in her strength. "She certainly was smooth," he thought. "Gee, I'd like to tell her she sounded swell."

And at last he got up and went along to the kitchen, and when he was at the door he saw his mother pouring herself a cup of tea. He watched and he didn't move. Her face, as she sat there, was a frightened, broken face utterly unlike the face of the woman who had been so assured a little while ago in the drugstore. When she reached out and lifted the kettle to pour hot water in her cup, her hand trembled and the water splashed on the stove. Leaning back in the chair, she sighed and lifted the cup to her lips, and her lips were groping loosely as if they would never reach the cup. She swallowed the hot tea eagerly, and then she straightened up in relief, though her hand holding the cup still trembled. She looked very old.

It seemed to Alfred that this was the way it had been every time he had been in trouble before, that this trembling had really been in her as she hurried out half-dressed to the drugstore. He understood why she had sat alone in the kitchen the night his young sister had kept repeating doggedly that she was getting married. Now

he felt all that his mother had been thinking of as they walked along the street together a little while ago. He watched his mother, and he never spoke, but at that moment his youth seemed to be over; he knew all the years of her life by the way her hand trembled as she raised the cup to her lips. It seemed to him that this was the first time he had ever looked upon his mother.

THE RETURNING

Section 1:

It was the only house he had seen for three days; it nestled just at the base of the foothills which led to the Mexican border. For a long time, he sat in the brush and wondered whether he should chance it. His throat was so dry he couldn't swallow; his mouth and lips were sore from lack of water and he felt that if he didn't get some kind of food in his stomach soon, it wouldn't make any difference whether he made the border or not.

He moved closer; from fifty yards away, he could see only a few chickens inside the fence; there was no other sign of life, no sounds, no smoke coming from the chimney though it was nearing sundown. Whoever lived out here in such isolation must be independent and have a mind of his own, he thought. It didn't have to follow that they would suspect him just because he was an Indian. And perhaps they might even give him some food and water.

He went very slowly now; many of these outlying places had dogs to keep a watch. When he was satisfied there was none, he noted that the front door was ajar about a foot or so; this added to the strangeness of the place. The wind blew in gusts and he saw dust in small clouds swirl up on the porch and some of it enter the house. That and the quiet made him see there was something very odd about this place.

In a moment he was up on the porch. After looking at the horizon, he squinted in beyond the door and saw a dust-covered living room, old furniture, and faded walls. There was no one about and he entered; then he heard the heavy breathing, like sighing from another room. The door on the left was half open, and when he reached it he heard the breathing more clearly. He pushed the door back silently and looked into a bedroom; and on the bed was a white woman and a small baby in her arms.

They were very sick, he saw close up; they seemed in a heavy unnatural sleep, almost like a coma. The woman coughed several times, a harsh, wracking cough that left her breathing all the louder. Her face was a deathly white and her eyelids trembled but never opened. The baby was exhaling quickly in a hoarse tone; on closer look, he saw the reddish tinge of its throat and neck. Then he felt he knew what was wrong with them.

He looked all over the house quickly until he found a kerosene lamp in the kitchen; he took the top off, dipped a piece of cloth in it, and went back to the bedroom where he rubbed both their throats with it. With more kerosene-soaked cloths wrapped around their throats, he used one wad at the end of a spoon to coat the insides of their throats with more of the spirit, a device he had seen his mother use

many years ago when he and his sisters had had diphtheria.

After he had a sip of water and munched on a hard piece of bread he found, he began the second phase of his treatment. With a damp towel he washed down both their bodies, then laid the baby out alongside the mother, who still wanted to hold it even in her condition. He then found two heavy blankets and threw them over the two patients. They slept on while he sat near and wondered what else he could do.

Section 2:

He recalled one old uncle saying that sufferers from the throat sickness seemed to get some relief from breathing fumes of gun powder. Having only a knife, he began another search of the house. But he could find no weapons or shells about, though he did find a can out on the back porch which was half-filled with kerosene; this he brought into the kitchen and placed it under the table for use later.

Back in the bedroom, he redampened the cloths around their necks and felt their pulses and foreheads. They were still very hot and uneasy, but their breathing didn't sound quite so rough as it had earlier. He placed the chair near the window and gazed out. It was a lonely stretch—a few small trees beyond the small patch of prairie, and then the rocky slope leading up. A woman and a baby here meant there had to be a man about; and for a long time he thought of fleeing before the man returned, but then he saw a cow come into view around the back and it made him see how thoughtless he had been.

He got a small fire going in the stove and put a pot of water on; he found some jellied soup in a larder and put that on the stove, too, to heat up. Then he took another small pan and went out to the cow which he milked for a long time before she would stand still long enough to give him a small amount. This, too, he put on the stove. He rechecked his patients and went outside to bring in more wood, to get the fire as hot as possible.

While he drank a small bit of the warm soup, he looked at the needlework in the dining room and scanned the living room which had small poems hanging up on the walls. One was entitled "Bless This Home," and another was a prayer to the Lord to give the occupants fortitude and patience. He stood before a third one a long time reading "Everyman is me, I am his brother. No man is my enemy. I am Everyman and He is Myself."

Out on the porch, he looked back the way he had come. Ten days and one man's life back, he had left the reservation, vowing never to return to that shameful bondage. But no sooner had he set out on his

way west than the chief notified the Indian agent, who sent several deputies to recapture him. He recalled how they had separated and the one had guessed his next move back in the Diablo mountains, surprising him in a narrow rocky pass. He had only wanted to get away; he hadn't wanted to stab the man who had been so careless and heavy-handed as to miss the knife in his pants and to cuss him out for a dumb injun who didn't know when he was well off.

He took the deputy's horse and rode south for three days before it fell to the ground, unable to move any farther or stand. He had gone about a hundred yards away when he turned and saw the buzzards circling in the sky above it. Throwing curses at them as a kind of relief and cover, he went back, drew his knife, and made a deep cut in the horse's neck. He sat near it, glaring up at the black birds while the life of the animal oozed out into the thick sandy stubble around them.

After he had been walking for a long while, he turned and looked back. He saw the birds beginning to glide lower and lower until they landed; and he tried to find some solace in the memory of the tribe elders explaining how buzzards and other ghouls helped keep the prairies clean. He tried to think of that but it didn't do much good. Just as it had never done any good to think of what the elders had said about their being brought into reservations. The whites had grown too numerous and powerful; his own people had grown weaker and fewer in number. It was a fact of life they had to accept in the long run. But even so, he did his best not to think about it. Things were bad enough without basking in their defeat.

So when the prospect of undergoing another summer of skimpy planting and harvesting on reservations faced him again, some weeks back, he began to drink all the more to bolster the decision he had made soon after they had been placed on the government land some two years before. And when the chief and several elders warned him two or three times in the past weeks, he knew the time had come. But before he could make a well-planned departure with supplies and a horse, he got into an argument with another man over a squaw and almost killed him in a fight; thus, before the elders could decide on his punishment, he slipped away one night with only the clothes he wore and his knife.

Knowing he had talked many times of heading west if and when he jumped the reservation, he decided to strike south instead, to throw off pursuers sent out by the chief and the agent. But they soon picked up his trail, and for a time he was desperate with the fear of being brought back to his people—not for the punishment they might set up for him, but for the shame he would have to bear, like an unruly hapless prisoner being brought back to his prison. He told himself many times that he would endure almost anything but that.

It was their passivity that he had found most unbearable back on the reservation. Not only had they become like little orphans waiting for the charity of the whites, but the chief and his people seemed satisfied to get less and less of what they were originally promised. More than once, he and several other braves had told the chief it was shameful for them, a tribe once as strong as the Blackfeet, to accept each new insult without so much as a word of complaint. But the chief had always promised to talk to the agent and never did; he knew full well if he dared to complain another elder would soon be chief and receiving the little favours from the agent.

True, there had often been unrest and talk of deserting the reservation; but it had always occured when men were drinking or bitter over the agent's shortcomings. Generally, the families accepted the few blankets and cows and horses and said that perhaps they were better off than other lone tribes who starved in bad weather. And when he had tried to argue that other tribes, even if some of them were starving, were still real people and not slaves to the whites, often he had been told that if he felt that way, why did he stay?

All through the night, he bathed and rebathed the patients with hot cloths and painted their throats. Once or twice he tried to get some soup down them but it didn't work. So he kept them warm and continued to watch them when he wasn't on the porch, watching the night. He wondered if he should continue south tomorrow or turn west as he had originally planned. He had heard tales of the opportunities in the Pacific Northwest or even up in the Yukon. Mexico was too close and offered only more land to flee through. He was weary and wanted to stop somewhere.

Section 3:

He dozed off in his chair and woke just before sunup; the woman was awake and saw him. She tried to sit up but was too weak; he moved to her and smiled down at her. "Are you feeling better?"

"Who are you?" Then before he could answer, she turned to her baby and held it close. "Is she going to be all right?"

"She is better," he nodded.

The woman scrutinized the baby for a moment and saw it was true. "Did you take care of her?"

He nodded again.

"Who are you?"

"I was passing and saw you were sick."

She looked over his dark, angular face, his stiff clothes and the way his odd appearance filled the room. "Are you a doctor?"

"No, but I've seen this sickness before."

She gazed at him. "It was very good of you to stop and help us."

"Is there no one else here? You have a husband?"

"He left a few days ago; he works for the sheriff of the county."

"Will he be back soon?"

"I don't know."

"You have no friends near, to help?"

"Only over in town," she said.

He nodded and told her, "You mustn't talk more. Rest, and I will stay until you are better."

When he had tucked her and the baby in and resumed his seat by the window, he found her eyes on him. "What is your name?" she asked.

"Nachobi," he said, giving the first name which came to him.

She smiled faintly and said, "Well, I'm very grateful to you."

When she slept again, he rose and went outside. Odd how the name of a dead kinsman had come to his lips, one who had been killed in battle and not been like those on the reservation. But then he realized it wasn't so odd after all; when he was a boy, his father had told him all the great names and he still remembered so many—Nachobi, Pionsoman, Long Face, Diniseau, and Laughing Cat after whom his father had wanted to name him. His mother had compromised on Darkcat, used as a white man's last name, and had given him the first name of Willis, after an agent she had admired.

He wondered if the woman's husband was on his trail, too. Perhaps not, since the reservation was up in Oklahoma; but he did know that he couldn't afford to remain here much longer. The deputy had to be coming home soon, and he wasn't going to like having Willis here, no matter what he had done for the woman and the baby. He told himself that he would leave sometime this day, as soon as the woman was strong enough to get food for her baby. In the meanwhile, he could keep checking with her on the location of her husband.

He stood by the window of the bedroom and gazed in on the woman. He wondered if his several women friends in the tribe still spoke of him, although it was probably forbidden by the Chief; and he wondered, too, if his old mother was being shunned by others because of this so-called shame. He pictured the small, bony woman with no teeth, who always watched him with those sad eyes when he grew from a wild boyhood into a bitter manhood; and he could still hear her saying, "You must see that we have to live thinner days now. Our ancestors, if they were alive with us, would be living just as we are." And he would never believe that; and he told her more than once when drinking, that the ancestors would never accept such a trammeled life, they would erupt like a river over its banks.

He never got over this feeling that he had been cursed in the time he was born; his life had spanned the whole decline and thus the memories he had as a boy led him into an empty maturity. Often when he had been a small boy, he had seen great chiefs and heard of victories over the whites. His father and his uncles had shown him bits of the glory; he had been like an observer of the epoch and didn't know until many years later that the epoch had been closing. If he had been born thirty years later, perhaps he would have listened to his mother's words and not felt quite so much dissatisfaction with himself and his people.

He had often envied the braves who had adapted themselves to the new life; they had taken their wives and plots of land and begun to work as any white man would on his homestead. When Willis and other drunken braves gathered late at night, they talked of these "white braves" and scoffed at their methods and outlook. And he joined in with the most scornful tones and sarcastic laugh. But when he was alone, he now and then wondered if perhaps the white braves weren't the wisest of their tribe. Most of the time, however, he tried not to think of them and never had anything to do with them.

If he knew he could never enter into the white braves' mode of life, he knew also that the existence of his cronies was as bad or worse. Night after night of drinking and lechering, gaming and fighting, was like letting out the pent up emotion of his wasting years. Now and again he woke up with a hangover lying among a bunch of sprawled forms and felt a bigger fool than any of them. He, too, was becoming old and paunchy and idiotic. But when the others got up and did a little work to get money for more liquor, he sat around staring at the circle of the horizon. That was when his anger would reach its whitest pitch; their ancestors had roamed the continent from one coast to another and here they were confined to a three-hundred-square-mile plot like fishes in a lake.

He found a small bottle later and put some warm milk in it for the baby; the mother woke up and fed it while he watched. The mother seemed stronger now; her fever was down and she didn't cough too often. As the baby drank slowly, she gazed up at Willis.

Section 4:

"Do you have to be moving on?"

"Yes, I do. I was waiting to see if you were better. Does your throat hurt much?"

"A little, but I'm much better, thanks to you."

She gazed down at her baby drinking.

"She looks better, too," he said

"Yes, she does, I don't know what we would've done without you."

He asked her how it had all happened and she told him that she and the baby had been hit almost simultaneously with a sudden fever and sore throat; then coughing and dizziness set in so that she had to take to her bed. He told her he had had diphtheria as a boy and had remembered some of the symptoms and treatments.

She smiled at him, and said, "It was divine providence that you happened by."

He asked if her husband often stayed away this long, and he was told that he did when his job demanded it, knowing she could take care of herself and the baby. "Until this time," she smiled.

He asked if she could swallow some soup and she said she would try. He brought some in to her and sat at the window as she drank it. She was a fairly young woman, hardy-looking, with a round face and long blond hair. Between sips, she asked where he came from and where he was bound. He made up a story of heading for a job in some Mexican goldfields. She said she wished he would stay long enough to receive the thanks of her husband who was probably on his way home by now. But that if he didn't, she would understand.

For a moment they were silent; he sat next to the window watching her, and she, between turning to the baby and drinking her soup, was looking at him. At another time and place, he wouldn't have wanted to linger in a room alone with a white woman. He had heard of more than one Indian in such an instance being accused of everything from attempted assault to terrorizing a helpless female. But here and now there was only friendliness between them; it was a kind of kinship he had never felt toward a white before. It made him think of the words he had read in the living room.

He saw that the woman was still weak; he took away the bottle and dish, and told her he would stay a while longer until she got a little more rest. She smiled tiredly and said it was very good of him, and she didn't know how to thank him. He resumed his post at the

window and took to scanning the northern prairie. He knew he was stretching his luck; if he was smart, he would wait until she dozed off and then leave. But somehow he just couldn't.

The longer he sat, however, the more restive he became. He began to think of the times his people had suffered at the hands of the whites, mainly for trusting the whites too much. One of his uncles had taught the saying that an Indian should trust the whites but keep his knife sharp. Perhaps the woman would never hurt him after what he had done for her, but the husband was something else again. He went outside and thought about what he should do.

Section 5:

While he tried to make a plan, he milked the cow, chopped more wood, fed the chickens, and cleaned the pots he had used. Then he brought several buckets of water in from the well out back; afterwards, he went back into the bedroom to see if she was awake. She was dozing and he took the chair to wait.

It was almost noon when she woke up. He smiled at her when she glanced over, and he said, "Feeling stronger?"

"Yes, very much so."

"I thought after I got you and the baby some lunch, I would leave."

"Of course, we've kept you far too long already. In fact, I can get up now." She started to sit up and he moved to her.

"Not yet," he told her. "Have some more soup and take a few more hours rest. You will feel better by evening."

"Maybe you're right." She lay back. "You're the doctor here."

He returned to the kitchen and got the soup ready. While she fed the baby and had some herself, she said she had to pay him in some way for all this help. He tried to protest but she insisted. "Is your horse rested and fed?" she asked. When he told her he had no horse, she said, "There's the answer; you'll take our spare horse."

"I couldn't do that," he said.

"But you must."

"It's kind of you, generous, but I can't take your horse."

For the next few moments, she kept insisting and he kept refusing. He had a pretty good idea of what would happen if he was caught

with a white man's horse. Back at the window, he noted a puff of dust in the distance. While he listened to her, he saw it grow until he could make out the form of a man on a horse. When she saw him gazing out, she asked, "Is someone coming?"

"Yes," he told her.

"It must be Jim, my husband." Perhaps she guessed his feelings, for she added, "I'm so glad he's come home before you left. I want to tell him all you've done for us."

He listened to her talking about moving closer to town and all the while he kept glancing at the approaching rider. Soon he could hear the hoofs of the horse hitting the ground and presently the rider was coming through the fence up to the house.

"That's him, I can tell by the sound," she said. When they heard steps on the porch, she sat up and called out, "Jim? I'm in here." The man came into the bedroom.

Section 6:

As he moved to his wife, he grew aware of Willis near the window. He stopped and stared at the Indian.

"This is Mr. Nachobi," the woman told him. "And if he hadn't come along yesterday, I don't know what you would've found here today." While the cowboy regarded the Indian searchingly, she gave him the whole story, laying a special stress on how Willis had worked like a doctor with only crude tools to save both her and the baby. The cowboy was around thirty, tall and lean, with the hard look of a man much in the saddle. He had fair skin and light eyes, which looked hard and soft at the same time. Now they seemed friendly as he said, "I'm much obliged to you; it was a damn fine thing you did here."

Willis nodded and waited.

"I told Mr. Nachobi that he had to take Daisy in payment," the woman went on. "He has no horse of his own and this is the least we can do. Don't you think so?"

"Of course," said the cowboy. "No buts about it, after all he did for us." He bent over his baby, eyed it closely, and then kissed it on the head. He then caressed the woman and looked back at Willis.

"He was just going to leave when you came," the woman told her husband.

"Sure glad you were here for me to thank you," he said to Willis.

"But I think he has to be on his way now," she went on.

The cowboy turned questioningly to Willis, who said this was true.

"Well then, I'll saddle up Daisy for you."

Willis said goodbye to the woman and followed the man out back.

He watched the cowboy bring the mare out of the barn and throw a saddle over her. After he had tightened the cinches and patted the horse, he turned and studied the Indian. "You're Darkcat, aren't you."

Now the blue eyes were cold and challenging. And Willis said it was so.

"I thought so as soon as I saw you." After a pause the cowboy went on. "For what you did, I can never repay you. It was as good as I've ever seen; not many white men would've done it." Another long pause. "We got the word on you last week and we found Jorgensen, the man you killed." Their eyes met and locked. "You know I can't let you go, don't you?" said the cowboy.

"I know," nodded Willis.

"All right. But for saving my wife and baby, I can give you a day."

Willis stared, not understanding.

"I've been in the saddle for five days, so I'm taking a day's rest. By then my wife'll be up and I can leave again. And then I'm coming after you. Understand?"

"I understand," said Willis.

"She's a good horse." He patted the mare. "She'll give you all she's got, you won't have to drive her much." He put a canteen of water up over the saddle horn and asked Willis if he wanted any food.

Willis refused, and they stood in silence. "Well," said Willis finally, "I'll leave now." He swung up into the saddle and gazed down at the man.

"I'll be starting out tomorrow about this time," said the cowboy.

Willis nodded.

"And make no mistake about it, I mean to get you."

"I understand," Willis repeated.

He moved the mare south toward the hills; he turned once and saw the cowboy still watching him. And he knew he was in for more and now perhaps even harder pursuit.

The farther he rode the less did he feel the cowboy had been boyish or silly or downright crazy. He saw that even amid the whites, there was still a touch of the old, undying spirit. And he felt he was closer to this blue-eyed white man than to any of his own people. When they finally did meet again over a gun or knife, it would be a more fitting finish for either than anything else that might come their way.

APPENDIX B

IDEA UNITS

EXAMPLES OF IDEA UNITS

Examples of idea units include one complete content unit from each of the stories. The reactions have been written as separate paragraphs for easy reference, those concerned with the same idea, have been given the same number.

Story 1 (Section 4)

No. 23

(1) "This part's getting more exciting. Well, I didn't think that girl had enough courage to ask Lil if she was going to be a servant. I didn't think she had the courage to do it.

(2) And I think Kezia was trying to be nice to the Kelveys.

(3) And I don't see why they should either skip higher or run faster—like, in and out of the skipping rope faster—just because she said that—because Lena said to Lil, 'Yeah, your father's in prison'—because she said that.

(1) And I don't see why they should get so excited with Lil.

(4) And I think Emmie is just like her mother. Well, it says, 'Emmie swallowed in a very meaningful way as she had seen her mother do.' I think she is like her mother. I think her mother is a snob. And I think they're all trying to act like their mothers—like, Isabel's just like her mother.

(2) But Kezia was trying to be nice to the Kelveys when she asked her mother if they could come into the doll house.

(5) And the last comment I made on the other section was about how they only liked Isabel because she had the doll house? Well, here it says, 'At last everybody had seen it except the Kelveys. On that day the subject rather flagged.' They weren't interested in it any more because everybody had seen it.

(1) And why should they think Lil Kelvey's going to be a servant when she grows up? Emmie Cole said that. I don't see what makes them think that.

(5) And I don't know—I think they're bothering the Kelveys because they already saw the doll house, and it's out of their minds, and they don't have anything to talk about. That's the only thing they do right now, because they don't dress the same as the other ones. (And I think that's all I can think of.)"

The comment referred to in Reaction 5, was retrieved from the previous content unit, and fastened to this reaction.

From Section 3

(5) "And I think those girls like her a little bit better only because she has a doll house, her friends. Because—I don't know how to say it—because I feel that's the way they are. Because they all want to be Isabel's friends to see the doll house first."

Story 2 (Section 6)

No. 35

(1) "I like this part.

(2) There's one thing that bothers me though—Alfred's mother—well, she seems to be shaking and everything. Well, after Alfred had gone, she went to the kitchen and made herself a cup of coffee, and she seemed frightened. Well, in the drugstore she wasn't. She seemed to be at ease. And when she got home, she seemed to be all shaking and everything.

(1) I like it very much. It's interesting, the way it's written.

(3) Well, about—in this section right here or section 4—I dunno—he said that he'd never get into that kind of a jam again. Well, before, it seems like he got into a lot. And maybe he was saying that, just so that his mother wouldn't get mad at him.

(4) And in the first part, when Alfred was coming out of the drugstore, I wonder how Mr. Carr seen those things in his pocket? Maybe he knew—before he put them in his pocket—maybe he knew that he was going to do it. Well, in here, it seems that this boy was being fired many times, and maybe he knew. It doesn't say that he seen him; it just says to take them out of his pocket. It just says that

he told Alfred to take it out of his pocket, and I wonder how he knew they were in his pocket.

(5) And well, about when Alfred talked when the train was passing? He talked just while the train was passing, so that his mother wouldn't hear him. And that gives me the idea that he's a little sneaky, and maybe he gets into a lot of trouble. I really pity his mother.

(6) And they mentioned something about his sister—that his younger sister kept repeating that she was going to get married. I wonder what that was in the story for? How does this part of the story fit in here? Well, he seems to be in trouble, and maybe he thought—when he saw his mother troubled—maybe he thought of all the other troubles that she'd had. And his sister came into his mind. (And I think that's about all.)"

Story 3 (Section 6)

No. 11

(1) "Well, this part told me how the man came walking in there pretending he didn't know who this Indian was.

(2) And the Indian, I thought he was really relieved and all that.

(3) And the man was thanking him for what he'd been doing.

(1) And all along he knew he was a criminal and he didn't want to say anything about that. Well, I thought that was rather nice of him, you know.

(4) Well, after a while he did tell him.

(3) And he made the Indian feel he was really thankful, and I thought the Indian really liked this.

(5) And they wanted to give him a horse and all that.

(5) But he didn't want to accept it at first and then they insisted, so he had to take it.

(4) When they went outside to saddle it up, the man told him that he knew who he was.

(6) And he was really surprised that he didn't want to do nothing. He knew he was a criminal, and he didn't want to take him. And the reason why he didn't want to take

him was he was real grateful for what he did for his wife and his child. And if I were him, I would have done the same thing—if I were the cowboy.

(7) Well, I like the ending. It left the Indian kind of puzzled why the man let him go for a day. He was giving him a chance to run away again, and he was real puzzled, I thought.

(8) Well, it was all very nice, and I like the way they told it and everything. I like the way—the people—the way they made them feel. They made me feel like that, too—like the Indian. Well, every bit of it—I don't know how to say it—it made me feel as if I was there, and it was all very interesting."